



# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 17]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अप्रैल 27, 1974/वैशाख 7, 1896

No. 17]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, APRIL 27, 1974/VAISAKHA 7, 1896

इस भाग में निम्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

### भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

### PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य क्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)

केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गये सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India

(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities

(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

संविमंडल सचिवालय

(कानूनी और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 अप्रैल, 1974

the accused (RC. No. 19/68-EOW/Delhi-Hind Cycle case) by the Additional Chief Presidency Magistrate, Bombay, in case No. 453/S of 1970.

[No. 225/25/74-AVD.II]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल, 1974

का० आ० 1049.—दण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उपधारा (6) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार बम्बई के एडवोकेट श्री पोरस ए० मेहता को, (आर० सी० नम्बर 19/68 ई० आ० डब्ल्यू०/दिल्ली-हिन्द साइकिल केस) में अपराधी को एडीशनल चीफ प्रेसिडेंसी मजिस्ट्रेट, बम्बई द्वारा केस नम्बर-453/एस० आर० 1970 में बरी किए जाने के आदेश के विरुद्ध राज्य द्वारा बम्बई हाई कोर्ट में दायर की गई अपील की पैरवी करने के लिए एतद्वारा विशेष लोक अभियोजक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 225/25/74-ए०वी०डी०-2]

### CABINET SECRETARIAT

(Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 9th April, 1974

**S.O. 1049.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (6) of section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Porus A. Mehta, Advocate, Bombay, as a Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the appeal filed in the Bombay High Court by the State against the order of acquittal of

का० आ० 1050.—दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 6, के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों, और इस निमित्त से उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा, उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य सरकार की सहमति से, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का, विस्फोटक पदार्थ अधिनियम, 1908 (1908 का 6) की धारा 4 और 5, तथा शस्त्र अधिनियम, 1959 (1959 का 54) की धारा 25 और 26 के अधीन वण्जनीय अपराधों और उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में थाना कानपुर छावनी के फौजदारी केस नम्बर 373 दिनांक 29-3-1974 पारस एवम अन्य के विरुद्ध—और कृपा शंकर, गणेश श्याम, गोविंद कुमार गुप्ता और श्री राम गुप्ता के विरुद्ध थाना सोसामऊ, कानपुर के फौजदारी केस नम्बर 164 तारीख 31-3-1974 के सम्बन्ध में किए गए किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों का अन्वेषण करने के लिए, समस्त उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में विस्तार करती है।

[संख्या 228/11/74-ए०वी०डी०-2]

बी० सी० यंत्राजी, अवर सचिव

(1065)

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1974

**S.O. 1050.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5, read with section 6, of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946), and of all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Central Government, with the consent of the Government of the State of Uttar Pradesh, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Uttar Pradesh for the investigation of offences punishable under sections 4 and 5 of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908 (6 of 1908), and sections 25 and 26 of the Arms Act, 1959 (54 of 1959), and any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction in regard to case Crime No. 373 dated 29-3-1974 of P.S. Cantonment, Kanpur, against Paras and others, and Crime No. 164 dated 31-3-1974 of P.S. Sisamau, Kanpur, against Kripa Shanker, Radhey Shyam, Govind Kumar Gupta and Shri Ram Gupta.

[No. 228/11/74-AVD.II]

B. C. VANJANI, Under Secy.

## भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

## आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 28 मार्च, 1974

**कां०ग्रा० 1051.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए हरयाणा विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 24-केथल सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री बट्टराम, ग्राम कांगथली, डा० सीजन, तहसील गूहला, जिला करनाल, हरयाणा लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं हैं ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री बट्टराम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० हर०-वि०स०/24/72(11)]

## ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th March, 1974

**S.O. 1051.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Wattu Ram, Village Kangthali, Post Office Sian, Tehsil Guhla, District Karnal, (Haryana), a contesting candidate for General Elections to the Haryana Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972 from 24-Kaithal assembly constituency has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Wattu Ram to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for

being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. HN-LA/24/72(11)]

## आदेश

**कां०ग्रा० 1052.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए हरयाणा विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 24-केथल सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री अल्लादाम, ग्राम हेमी माजरा, तहसील गूहला, जिला करनाल, हरयाणा लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं ;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित नहीं है ;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री अल्लादाम को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधानसभा अथवा विधान परिषद के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० हर०-वि०स०/24/72/(12)]

ए० एन० सेन, सचिव।

## ORDER

**S.O. 1052.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Alla Dass, Village Hemi Majra, Tehsil Guhla, District Karnal, Haryana a contesting candidate for General Elections to the Haryana Legislative Assembly held in March, 1972 from 24-Kaithal assembly Constituency has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

2. And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Alla Dass to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. HN-LA/24/72(12)]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

## आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 अप्रैल, 1974

**कां०ग्रा० 1053.**—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा के लिए साधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 41-सान्ताक्रूज निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नामदेव शिवराम भोसले, अम्बेडकर सोसायटी पार्क राइड, विक्रोली, बम्बई-79, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तदधीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित रीति से अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार द्वारा दिये गये अभ्यावेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री नामदेव शिवराम भोसले को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० महाराष्ट्र-वि०/41/72(58)]

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd April, 1974

**S.O. 1053.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Namdeo Shivram Bhosale, Ambedkar Society, Park side, Vikroli, Bombay-79, a contesting candidate in the general election held in March, 1972, to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 41-Santacruz constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas after considering the representation made by the said candidate, the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Namdeo Shivram Bhosale to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MT-LA/41/72(58)]

#### आदेश

का० आ० 1054.—यतः निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए महाराष्ट्र विधान सभा के लिए माधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 90-भुसावल निर्वाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्रीमती सत्याभामाबाई सुधाकर मोरे, रेलवे नार्थ कालोनी, क्वार्टर नं० 864 भुसावल (महाराष्ट्र) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा सद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रही हैं;

और यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिये जाने पर भी अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है;

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्रीमती सत्याभामाबाई सुधाकर मोरे को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० महाराष्ट्र-वि० सं०/90/72(59)]

#### ORDER

**S.O. 1054.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shrimati Satyabhamabai Sudhakar More, Railway North Colony, Quarter No. 864, Bhusawal (Maharashtra), a con-

testing candidate in the general election held in March, 1972, to the Maharashtra Legislative Assembly from 90-Bhusawal constituency, has failed to lodge an account of her election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that she has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shrimati Satyabhamabai Sudhakar More to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MT/LA/90/72/(59)]

#### आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 7 अप्रैल, 1974

का० आ० 1055.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि जून, 1973 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए उप-निर्वाचन के लिए 225 देहरी निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री नथुनी प्रसाद चौधरी ग्राम व पो० अम्बियाबाग, जिला रोहतास (बिहार) लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा सद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक् सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अथवा स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और, निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायोचित्य नहीं है,

अतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन आयोग एतद्वारा उक्त श्री नथुनी प्रसाद चौधरी को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रादेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार-वि० सं०/225/73-उप(45)]

वी० नागसुब्रमण्यन, सचिव

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th April, 1974

**S.O. 1055.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Nathuni Prasad Choudhary, Village & P.O. Amiawar, District Rohtas who was a contesting candidate for by-election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 225-Dehri constituency filed in June, 1973 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas, the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Nathuni Prasad Choudhary to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-LA/225/73-Bye (45)]

V. NAGASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.

## वित्त मंत्रालय

## (राजस्व और सीमा विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 27 अप्रैल, 1974

## (सीमा शुल्क)

का० प्रा० 1056.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सीमा-शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में उल्लिखित, त्रिपुरा राज्य में तैनात, केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल के अधिकारियों को, उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ 3 में की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट सीमा-शुल्क अधिकारियों के कृत्य सीपती है और निदेश देती है कि केन्द्रीय रिजर्व पुलिस बल का प्रत्येक ऐसा अधिकारी अपनी अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर सीमा-शुल्क अधिकारियों के कृत्यों का प्रयोग करेगा।

क्रम अधिकारियों का पदामिधान सीमा-शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 सं० के उपबन्धों के अधीन कृत्य

1	2	3
1. पुलिस के सभी कमन्डेंट, सहायक धारा 100 से 104 (जिसमें यह कमन्डेंट और उप-अधीक्षक। दोनों सम्मिलित हैं), 106, 107, 109 और 110 के अधीन और ऐसे स्थानों पर जहाँ सीमा-शुल्क और केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क के अधीक्षक के या उससे ऊपर के रैंक का कोई अधिकारी तैनात नहीं है, धारा 105 और 108 के भी अधीन कृत्य।		
2. सभी सुबेदार-मेजर, सुबेदार और धारा 100 से 101 (जिसमें यह उप-निरीक्षक। दोनों सम्मिलित हैं), 106, 107, 109 और 110 के अधीन कृत्य।		
3. सभी प्रधान कांस्टेबल और नायक। धारा 100, 102, 106 और 110 के अधीन कृत्य।		

[सं० 33/का०सं० 566/1/74-एल सी-11]

## MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue &amp; Insurance)

New Delhi, the 27th, April, 1974

## CUSTOMS

S.O. 1056.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Customs Act 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Government hereby entrusts to the officers of the Central Reserve Police Force, mentioned in column 2 of the Table below, posted in the State of Tripura, the functions of an officer of Customs specified in the corresponding entry in column 3 of the said Table and directs that each such officer of the Central Reserve Police Force, shall exercise the functions of an officer of customs within the local limits of his jurisdiction.

S. No.	Designation of officers.	Functions under the provisions of the Customs Act, 1962
1	2	3
1.	All Commandants, Assistant Commandants and Deputy Superintendents of Police.	Functions under section 100 to 104 (both inclusive), 106, 107, 109, and 110 and also under sections 105 and 108 in places, where no officer of customs of the rank of the Superintendent of Customs and Central Excise or above is stationed.

1	2	3
2.	All Subedar Majors, Subedars and Sub-Inspectors.	Functions under sections 100 to 104 (both inclusive), 106, 107, 109, and 110.
3.	All Head Constables and Naiks.	Functions under sections 100, 102, 106 and 110.

[No. 33/F. No. 566/1/74-LC II]

## केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 27 अप्रैल, 1974

## सीमा-शुल्क

का० प्रा० 1057.—सीमा-शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड:—

- बिहार राज्य के रक्सौल और फारबिसगंज तथा
- उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य के गोरखपुर और गोरखपुर हवाईक्षेत्र को भाण्डारण केन्द्र के रूप में घोषित करता है।

[मं० 34/74-सीमा-शुल्क/का० सं० 473/64/एण्ड-74-सी० शु० 7]

के० शंकररामन, अवर सचिव

## CENTRAL BOARD OF EXCISE AND CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 27th April, 1974

## CUSTOMS

S.O. 1057.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares—

- Raxaul and Forbesganj in the State of Bihar; and
- Basti, Gorakhpur and Gorakhpur Airfield area in the State of Uttar Pradesh;

to be warehousing stations.

[No. 34/74-Customs/F. No. 473/64/74-Cus. VII]

K. SANKARARAMAN, Under Secy.

## बैंकिंग विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 8 अप्रैल, 1974

का० प्रा० 1058.—बैंकिंग विनियमन अधिनियम 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सफाई पर भारत सरकार एतद्वारा घोषित करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उधारा (1) के प्रावधान 31 मार्च, 1972 से 28 जून, 1973 तक की अवधि के लिये जलपाइगुरी सेण्ट्रल कोऑपरेटिव बैंक लि०, जलपाइगुरी पर लागू नहीं होगा।

[सं० एफ० 8/2/74-ए० सी०]

विजय कुमार, उप-सचिव

## (Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 8th April, 1974

S.O. 1058.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 read with section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 11 of the said Act shall not apply to the Jalpaiguri Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Jalpaiguri, for the period from 31st March, 1972 to 28 June, 1973.

[No. F. 8/2/74-AC]

V. K. SHUNGLU, Dy. Secy.

## रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया

नई दिल्ली, 15 अप्रैल, 1974

कां०प्र० 1059.—रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में अप्रैल, 1974 की 5 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

## हथू विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	2,76,08,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियत :—		
संचलन में नोट	62,68,37,93,000		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,05,000	
			(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ	..	
			विदेशी प्रतिभूतियाँ	111,73,97,000	
			जोड़		324,27,02,000
जारी किये गये कुल नोट		6271,14,01,000	रुपये का सिक्का		1,78,74,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियाँ		5945,08,25,000
			देशी विनियम बिल और दूसरे		..
			वाणिज्य-पत्र		..
कुल देयताएं		6271,14,01,000	कुल आस्तियाँ		6271,14,01,000

## 5 अप्रैल 1974 को रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यालयाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियाँ	रुपये
चुफ़ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	2,76,08,000
आरक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	4,11,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि	239,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	3,27,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि	85,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण		(क) देशी	262,42,59,000
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि अमाराशियां :—	205,00,00,000	(ख) विदेशी	..
(क) सरकारी		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल	102,29,87,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	65,99,85,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ ढकाया*	366,34,83,000
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	21,86,55,000	निवेश**	324,67,86,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	647,46,98,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	..
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	16,65,03,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को†	176,79,96,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	1,55,80,000	ऋण और अग्रिम :	
		(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को†	378,16,50,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक	79,00,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को†	222,64,33,000
		(iii) दूसरों को	5,24,10,000
(ग) अन्य	123,28,49,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें)	
देय बिल	169,15,78,000	निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम निवेश	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
अन्य देयताएं	541,41,19,000	(i) राज्य सरकारों को	67,98,41,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	17,91,55,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों को	..
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	36,70,00,000
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबंधक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश	11,27,67,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम	
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	52,24,83,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	155,07,29,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश	..
		अन्य आस्तियाँ	89,55,42,000
रुपये	2272,18,67,000	रुपये	2272,18,67,000

\*नकदी, आबधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियाँ शामिल हैं।

\*\*राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

†राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

‡ रिज़र्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम को धारा 17(4)(ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को सीयादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 33,55,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

‡ राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख 10 अप्रैल, 1974

एस० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर

[सं० फ० 10/1/74 बी०प्र०।]

अ० व० मीरजवादी, प्रवर सचिव

## RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

New Delhi 15th April, 1974

S.O.1059.—An Account pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934, for the week ended the 5th day of April 1974.

## ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department . . . . .	2,76,08,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation . . . . .	6268,37,93,000		(a) Held in India . . . . .	182,53,05,000	
Total Notes issued . . . . .		6271,14,01,000	(b) Held outside India . . . . .		
			Foreign Securities . . . . .	141,73,97,000	
			Total . . . . .		324,27,02,000
			Rupee Coin . . . . .		1,78,74,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities . . . . .		5945,08,25,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper . . . . .		
TOTAL LIABILITIES . . . . .		6271,14,01,000	Total Assets . . . . .		6271,14,01,000

Dated the 10th day of April 1974.

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor.

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 5th April 1974.

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid up . . . . .	5,00,00,000	Notes . . . . .	2,76,08,000
Reserve Fund . . . . .	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin . . . . .	4,11,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	239,00,00,000	Small Coin . . . . .	3,27,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	85,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund . . . . .	205,00,00,000	(a) Internal . . . . .	262,42,59,000
Deposits : -		(b) External . . . . .	
(a) Government		(c) Government Treasury Bills . . . . .	102,29,87,000
(i) Central Government . . . . .	65,99,85,000	Balance Held Abroad* . . . . .	366,34,83,000
(ii) State Governments . . . . .	21,86,55,000	Investments** . . . . .	324,67,86,000
(b) Banks		Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks . . . . .	647,46,98,000	(i) Central Government . . . . .	
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	16,65,03,000	(ii) State Governments@ . . . . .	176,79,96,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	1,55,80,000	Loans and Advances to :—	
(iv) Other Banks . . . . .	79,00,000	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks† . . . . .	378,16,50,000
(c) Others . . . . .	123,28,49,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks†† . . . . .	222,64,33,000
Bills Payable . . . . .	169,15,78,000	(iii) Others . . . . .	5,24,10,000
Other Liabilities . . . . .	541,41,19,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) State Governments . . . . .	67,98,41,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	17,91,55,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks . . . . .	
		(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation . . . . .	36,70,00,000
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank . . . . .	
		Debentures Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	11,27,67,000
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	52,24,83,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank . . . . .	155,07,29,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank . . . . .	
		Other Assets . . . . .	89,55,42,000
RUPEES . . . . .	2272,18,67,000	RUPEES . . . . .	2272,18,67,000

\* Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

\*\* Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

† Includes Rs. 33,55,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Sectional 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

†† Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 10th day of April 1974.

S. Jagannathan, Governor.

[No.F.10(1)/74 -BOI]

C.W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

## (Department of Expenditure)

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1974

"XXIV—Workcharged establishment of the Reactor Research Centre, Kalpakkam, Tamil Nadu".

## EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

The Contributory Provident Fund shall apply, with effect from 1st April, 1973, to all eligible workers who have put in at least one year continuous service on that date. None of the employees of the Reactor Research Centre, Kalpakkam, Tamil Nadu, will be adversely affected by giving retrospective effect to the Scheme.

[No. F. 19(1)-E.V.(B)/74]

S. S. L. MALHOTRA, Under Secy.

**S.O. 1060.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following further amendment in the rules regulating the Workmen's Contributory Provident Fund as instituted with the Government of India, late Finance Department Resolution No. F. 33(3)-R.II/44, dated the 16th April, 1945, namely:—

In paragraph 1 of the said Resolution, after entry XXIII, the following entry shall be added and shall be deemed to have been added with effect from the 1st April, 1973, namely:—

प्रायकर प्रायुक्त कार्यालय,

नई दिल्ली, 8 अप्रैल, 1974

**क्र०प्रा० 1016.**—प्रायकर अधिनियम, 1961/(1961 का 43) की धारा 287 के अनुसार भारत सरकार वित्त मंत्रालय (राजस्व तथा वीमा विभाग), नई दिल्ली के आदेश एफ० सं० 16/202/67-आई०टी०बी० दिनांक 25-3-1969, के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा प्राधिकृत तथा निर्देशित, निम्नलिखित निर्धारितियों, जिनके वित्तीय वर्ष 1972-73 के दौरान निर्धारण हुआ है, के नाम और उनसे सम्बन्धित अन्य विवरणों को एतद्वारा प्रकाशित किया जाता है:

(1) व्यष्टियों या हि०अ० कुटुम्बों के रूप में जिनका 1 लाख रु० से अधिक आय पर निर्धारण हुआ है।

(2) फर्मों, व्यक्ति-संगम या कम्पनियों के रूप में, जिनका 10 लाख रु० से अधिक की आय पर निर्धारण हुआ है।

I सभी व्यष्टियों तथा हिन्दू अविभक्त कुटुम्बों के नाम जिनका वित्तीय वर्ष 1972-73 के दौरान 1 लाख रु० या अधिक की आय पर निर्धारण हुआ है।

क्रम सं०	निर्धारित का नाम और पता	प्राप्ति	निर्धारण वर्ष	कुल निर्धारित आय
1	2	3	4	5
				रु०
1.	श्रीमती आशा रानी, द्वारा मैमर्स बेदी बूलन एण्ड सिल्क मिल्स, इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया-ए, लुधियाना	व्यष्टि	1970-71	2,55,605
2.	श्री अनिल मोहन गुप्ता, द्वारा, मैमर्स प्रोटो सेल्स, पी०डी० टैंक रोड, इलाहाबाद	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,01,790
3.	श्री अजय गुप्ता मार्गणल, श्री एच० सी० गुप्ता, कामसियल मोटर्स बिल्डिंग, 11-महाराजा गांधी रोड, लखनऊ	व्यष्टि	1970-71	3,26,118
4.	श्री बी० डी० गुप्ता, द्वारा मैमर्स जसवन्तपुर शूगर मिल्स, मेरठ	हि०अ०कु०	1970-71	16,29,760
5.	श्री ज्ञान मोहन गुप्ता, द्वारा, मैमर्स प्रोटो सेल्स, पी०डी० टैंक रोड, इलाहाबाद	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,06,120
6.	श्री बाण चन्द सोनी, द्वारा मैमर्स आर०के० मशीन टूल्स, लुधियाना	व्यष्टि	1970-71	18,05,890
7.	एस० बलदेव सिंह बाबा, 35-राजपुरा रोड दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1956-57	1,56,350
8.	एस० बलवन्त सिंह बाबा, 35-राजपुरा रोड, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1955-56	4,51,586
9.	काजी अब्दुल मजीब, पेम्पोश हॉटल, रेजिडेन्सी रोड, श्री नगर	व्यष्टि	1970-71	4,48,440
10.	बख्शी बशीर अहमद भागीदार मैमर्स फेयरडील मोटर्स, रेजिडेन्सी रोड, श्री नगर	व्यष्टि	1963-64 1970-71	1,32,540 1,65,790
11.	मैमर्स बजेक सिंह एण्ड संस 12-रोशनपारा रोड, दिल्ली	हि०अ०कु०	1960-61	1,09,490
12.	श्री अरन दास, द्वारा मैमर्स जगतू मल कुन्दन लाल, पटियाला	व्यष्टि	1972-73	1,01,120
13.	श्री अरनजीत सिंह, द्वारा एस० मोहन सिंह बिल्डिंग कनाट मार्केट, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1972-73	3,88,761
14.	श्री सी०एम० चावला, द्वारा मैमर्स यूनियर्सल बुक स्टाल, 97 बी माल, कानपुर	व्यष्टि	1970-71	7,14,300
15.	श्री ठैल बिहारी लाल, द्वारा मैमर्स के० एन० ग्राहृजा एण्ड एम० के० अतरथ, 39-डी०, एन०डी०एम०ई०, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1967-68	1,01,906
16.	मैमर्स धर्मवीर, मोटिया पड़ाव, हलडानी	हि०अ०कु०	1970-71	1,78,589

1	2	3	4	5
				₹०
17.	श्री दुली चन्द, ए-14/3, आसफ अली रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1968-69 1969-70 1970-71	3,85,357 4,40,170 5,86,487
18.	श्री श्री० आर० भागो, द्वारा मैसर्स जगतलाल एण्ड संस, 49-कुतुब रोड, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1956-57	2,77,558
19.	एम० दलजीत सिंह, द्वारा एस० मोहन सिंह बिल्डिंग, कनाट मार्कम, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1969-70	1,87,789
20.	आर. बी. सेठ जी, एम० मोदी, मोदी नगर	व्यष्टि	1970-71	2,23,752
21.	श्री गुन्जन गुप्ता, कामशियल मोटर्स बिल्डिंग, 11-हजरत गंज, लखनऊ	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,22,530
22.	श्री गोरी शंकर भागीदार मैसर्स पी० एम० मोटर एण्ड जनरल फाइनेन्स कं०, ए-14/3, आसफ अली रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1969-70 1970-71	1,22,340 2,48,339
23.	श्री गोरी शंकर, सी-6/4, माडल टाउन, नई दिल्ली	हि०अ०कु०	1970-71	2,54,225
24.	श्री जी० एस० पुरी, आर-619, माडल टाउन, जलन्धर	व्यष्टि	1962-63	1,01,584
25.	श्री ए० पी० नंदा, 12-जोर बाग, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1971-72 1972-73	2,29,942 2,80,323
26.	श्री ए० पी० नन्दा एण्ड संस, 12-जोर बाग, नई दिल्ली	हि०अ०कु०	1971-72	1,16,591
27.	श्री हृदय नारायण गोयल, बिहारपुर, बरेली	हि०अ०कु०	1958-59	1,35,300
28.	श्री हृदय नारायण गोयल, बिहारपुर, बरेली	व्यष्टि	1958-59	1,35,000
29.	श्री हरिकृष्ण राठी, लोनी रोड, शाहदरा	हि०अ०कु०	1970-71	1,34,030
30.	श्री हृकुम चन्द गुप्ता, कामशियल, मोटर्स बिल्डिंग, 11-हजरत गंज, लखनऊ	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,77,650
31.	श्री हरि राज स्वरूप, मुजफ्फर नगर	व्यष्टि	1959-70	1,16,720
32.	एम० इन्द्र सिंह, द्वारा मैसर्स सिंह इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स (प्रा०) लि०, जी० टी० रोड, कानपुर	व्यष्टि	1972-73	2,14,120
33.	श्री इन्द्र नारायण, द्वारा मैसर्स ईस्टर्न आर्ट्स कारपोरेशन, आसफ अली रोड, दिल्ली	हि०अ०कु०	1971-72	1,55,671
34.	श्री जगदीश राय जैन, द्वारा मैसर्स जैन ब्रादर्स, हौज काजी, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1971-72	1,51,893
35.	श्री जगदीश प्रसाद, द्वारा मैसर्स ईस्टर्न आर्ट्स कारपोरेशन, आसफ अली रोड, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1971-72	1,44,667
36.	श्री जगदीश राय जैन, 110-डी०, कमला नगर, नई दिल्ली-1	हि०अ०कु०	1963-64 1964-65 1965-66	1,35,741 2,97,834 2,27,251
37.	श्री जगत कुमार सेठिया, मानिक मैसर्स ग्रामास बंगाल टी एंजिनी, 2285-गली हिरजा बेग, निलक बाजार, खारी बावली, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1970-71	2,00,000
38.	सेठ के०एन० मोदी, मोदी नगर	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,04,453
39.	श्री कमलेश कुमारी राठी, लोनी रोड, शाहदरा	व्यष्टि	1967-68	1,31,648
40.	श्रीमती के० शमशेर सिंह, 13-एफ०, कनाट प्लेस, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,44,781
41.	श्री कैलाश लाम्बा, पंचकुहिया रोड, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1963-64	1,71,510
42.	श्री के० पी० सिंह, 14-प्रौरंगजेव रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,03,379
43.	श्री ए० पी० जायसवाल, 54-रिंग रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1963-64	2,30,310
44.	श्री लक्ष्मी नारायण, ए-14/3, आसफ अली रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,62,300
45.	पंडित लीला राम, 279, मस्जिद मोठ, नई दिल्ली	हि०अ०कु०	1970-71	9,29,470
46.	मैसर्स मन्सारास एण्ड संस, 31/1, कन्वेंट रोड, बेहराइन	हि०अ०कु०	1946-47 1948-49 1949-50 1951-52 1952-53 1953-54	5,43,835 1,35,050 1,79,184 1,67,560 6,26,930 3,06,130



1	2	3	4	5
				रु०
		हि० अ० कु०	1955-56	1,03,940
			1965-66	3,02,860
			1969-70	1,70,630
			1970-71	3,38,000
			1971-72	1,08,000
47. श्री मनोहर लाल गुप्ता, द्वारा मैसर्स ओटो वेल्स., पी० डी० टण्डन, रोड, इलाहाबाद	व्यष्टि		1970-71	1,45,730
48. श्री मनोहर लाल, 57-राजपुर रोड, देहरादून	व्यष्टि		1970-71	2,19,864
49. श्री एम० एल० नारंग, 16-ए, सुन्दर नगर मार्केट नई, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	8,99,655
50. श्रीमती मकसूदा बेगम, मुनीर मंजिल, लेम्बर्ट लेन, श्रीनगर	व्यष्टि		1970-71	2,32,060
51. मोहम्मद युनुस भागीदार शमा मैगजीन, 12-13 आसफ अली रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	1,21,789
52. मोहम्मद युमुक, भागीदार शमा मैगजीन, 12-13, आसफ अली रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	1,58,757
53. श्री सदन लाम्बा, द्वारा मैसर्स बालगा रैस्टोरेट, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	2,34,530
			1971-72	1,70,217
			1972-73	2,47,172
54. श्रीमती निर्मला गुप्ता, द्वारा मैसर्स होटल टूरिस्ट, राम नगर, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1972-73	111,784
55. श्री निरंजन लाल जैन, द्वारा मैसर्स जैन ब्रादर्स, होज काजी, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1971-72	1,52,086
56. श्री एन० के० सोनी०, द्वारा मैसर्स बेदी वूलेन एण्ड मिलक मिल्स, इण्डस्ट्रीयल एरिया-ए, लुधियाना	व्यष्टि		1970-71	16,87,025
57. श्री श्री० पी० नारंग, 16-ए, सुन्दर नगर मार्केट, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	2,98,768
58. श्रीमती प्रीता बेदी, द्वारा मैसर्स जगनु मल कुन्वर लाल, पटियाला	व्यष्टि		1972-73	1,04,850
59. श्री पद्म चन्द, द्वारा मैसर्स ईस्टर्न आर्ट्स कारपोरेशन, आसफ अली रोड, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	1,70,665
60. श्री पूरनमल, 12-ई, कमला नगर, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1960-61	5,26,120
			1967-68	17,27,080
			1968-69	17,16,000
			1969-70	20,20,000
			1970-71	24,20,000
61. श्री प्रेम राज, 279 मसजिद मोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	1,18,914
62. सेठ पूरन चन्द, 5, कर्जन रोड, नई दिल्ली	हि० अ० कु०		1970-71	16,81,090
63. श्रीमती शशरानी, द्वारा होटल टूरिस्ट, राम नगर, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1972-73	1,23,279
64. श्री रबीन्द्र कुमार गुप्ता, भागीदार मैसर्स एस० चांद एण्ड कम्पनी, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1971-72	1,65,680
65. श्री आर० के० गुप्ता, भागीदार मैसर्स एस० चांद एण्ड कम्पनी, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1971-72	2,00,570
			1972-73	1,24,651
66. श्री रामा नन्द जैन, द्वारा मैसर्स जैन ब्रादर्स, होज काजी, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	1,37,790
			1971-72	2,06,944
67. श्री आर० के० सोनी, द्वारा मैसर्स बेदी वूलेन एण्ड मिलक मिल्स, इण्डस्ट्रीयल एरिया-ए, लुधियाना।	व्यष्टि		1970-71	16,76,629
68. श्री आर० एल० नारंग, 16-ए, सुन्दर नगर मार्केट, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1970-71	8,16,297
69. श्री रोशन लाल (विश्वगत), ए-14/3, आसफ अली रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1969-70	1,88,577
			1970-71	3,54,377
70. श्री राजन वितायक, भूटिया पड़ाव, हनुमाना	व्यष्टि		1970-71	2,78,159
71. श्री आर० शालमिया, 10-वरिया गंज, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि		1953-54	7,77,610
			1957-58	27,67,874
			1960-61	52,71,590
			1970-71	1,61,125

1	2	3	4	5
				रु०
72.	श्री राजेन्द्र लाल मारफत श्रीमती बिमला रानी, मेरठ	हि०अ०कु०	1970-71	20,14,970
73.	राज कुमारी गुप्ता, 23-अशोक मार्ग, लखनऊ	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,14,950
74.	श्री सुरेन्द्र कुमार, द्वारा मैसर्स इण्डिया इम्प्लिमेंट्स मैनुफैक्चरिंग, कम्पनी, मारिश रोड, अलीगढ़।	व्यष्टि	1967-68 1968-69	1,26,430 1,42,110
75.	श्री सुधीर कुमार, सुधीर निकेतन, मारिश रोड, अलीगढ़	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,37,950
76.	श्रीमती सरला कपूर, सुधीर निकेतन, मारिश रोड, अलीगढ़	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,35,820
77.	श्री रामशेर सिंह, 13-एफ, कनाट प्लेस, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1967-68 1968-69 1969-70 1970-71	1,31,191 1,74,528 2,11,570 1,42,901
78.	श्री एम० एल० गुप्ता, भारीदार मैसर्स एम० चांद एण्ड कं०, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1971-72	1,77,698
79.	श्री एम० आर० जैन, द्वारा मैसर्स जैन ब्रादर्स, होत्र काजी, दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1970-71 1971-72	1,18,026 1,92,164
80.	श्री श्याम लाल, द्वारा मैसर्स जगदुलाल कुन्दन लाल, पटियाला	व्यष्टि	1972-73	1,25,430
81.	श्री संजीव कुमार, द्वारा किरन सिनेमा, चंडीगढ़	व्यष्टि	1972-73	1,01,871
82.	श्री टी० पी० खेतान, द्वारा मैसर्स अमृत वनास्पति कम्पनी लि०, जी० टी० रोड, गाजियाबाद।	व्यष्टि	1970-71 1971-72	1,92,930 1,73,465
83.	श्रीमती ऊषा नारायण, द्वारा मैसर्स ईस्ट आर्ट निटवियर, आमक अली रोड, नई दिल्ली।	व्यष्टि	1970-71	1,88,111
84.	श्री विजय प्रसाद, द्वारा मैसर्स ईस्ट आर्ट निटवियर, आमक अली रोड, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1970-71	2,15,200
85.	श्री बी० के० सोनी, द्वारा मैसर्स बेबी बूनेन एण्ड मिन्क मिन्क, इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया-ए, लुधियाना।	व्यष्टि	1970-71	16,83,942
86.	श्री बी० एच० डालमिया, 4-मिथिया हाउस, नई दिल्ली	व्यष्टि	1970-71	2,29,646

## II—कम्पानियों, व्यक्तियों और फर्मों के नाम जिनका 10 लाख से अधिक की प्राय पर निर्धारण हुआ है

1.	मैसर्स ओटो सेल्स, पी० डी० टन्डन रोड, इलाहाबाद	अपंजीकृत फर्म	1970-71	10,08,260
2.	मैसर्स एनफोर प्रेमिगस (प्रा०) लि०, मारिश रोड, अलीगढ़	क०	1970-71	12,12,800
3.	मैसर्स भारतनिधि लि०, 7-बहादुरशाह जफर मार्ग, नई दिल्ली	क०	1972-73	14,19,340
4.	मैसर्स चमन एस्टेट्स (प्रा०) लि०, 167-पी० डी० सेली रोड, बम्बई	क०	1961-62	12,16,369
5.	मैसर्स डालमिया दादरी सीमेंट लि० 10-नरिया गंज, दिल्ली	क०	1970-71	33,99,615
6.	मैसर्स डालमिया सीमेंट (भारत) लि० 4-मिथिया हाउस, नई दिल्ली	क०	1970-71	1,66,31,270
7.	मैसर्स डालमिया सीमेंट लि०, 4-मिथिया हाउस, नई दिल्ली	क०	1972-73	55,28,670
8.	मैसर्स धर्मसिंह रामसिंह 12-रोशनआरा रोड, दिल्ली	पं० फर्म	1955-56 1856-57	21,32,350 16,17,770
9.	मैसर्स एस्कोर्ट्स लि० रोशनआरा रोड, दिल्ली	क०	1969-70 1970-71	1,35,37,040 1,54,43,256
10.	मैसर्स गोईटज (इण्डिया) लि०, रोशनआरा रोड, दिल्ली	क०	1970-71 1971-72 1972-73	37,90,322 48,48,942 67,93,308
11.	मैसर्स गोलखा प्रोपर्टीज (प्रा०) लि० (परिवहन में) जयपुर	क० <sup>1</sup>	1970-71 1971-72	15,97,499 18,37,345
12.	मैसर्स गणेश फ्लोर मिल्स क० लि०, सब्जी मन्डी, दिल्ली	क०	1969-70 1970-71	14,00,000 30,00,000

1	2	3	4	5
				₹०
13.	मैसर्स हरि बावर्स (प्रा०) लि०, 4-सिधिया हाउस, नई दिल्ली	क०	1970-71	10,60,904
14.	मैसर्स हिरण्य नारायण मूरज प्रकाश, विहारी पुर, बरेली	फर्म	1957-58	14,47,212
			1958-59	12,24,010
			1959-60	13,94,264
15.	मैसर्स जमबंन गुजर मिल्स लि०, मेरठ	क०	1970-71	42,86,650
16.	मैसर्स जयपुर उद्योग लि०, जयपुर	क०	1969-70	70,27,542
			1970-71	39,02,840
17.	मैसर्स जगतजीत इण्डस्ट्रीज लि०, क० 54-रिंग रोड, नई दिल्ली	क०	1969-70	28,10,834
			1970-71	44,54,528
18.	मैसर्स कुन्दन गुजर मिल्स (प्रा०) लि०, अमरोहा	क०	1970-71	11,92,920
19.	मैसर्स मारो मिनिंग एण्ड ब्रीकिंग लि० लि० मांसे नगर	क०	1962-63	48,86,710
			1963-64	45,65,616
			1964-65	26,64,572
			1965-66	30,99,562
			1966-67	53,74,703
			1967-68	55,69,330
			1968-69	23,83,260
			1970-71	10,13,974
20.	मै० मोदी इण्डस्ट्रीज लि० मोदी नगर	क०	1970-71	69,10,352
21.	मै० मोदी पोन लि०, मोदी नगर	क०	1970-71	1,68,54,900
22.	मै० उड़ीसा सीमेंट लि०, 4-सिधिया हाउस, नई दिल्ली	क०	1970-71	1,01,05,714
23.	मै० आर० के० मशीन टूल्स, इण्डस्ट्रीयल एरिया, लुधियाना	प० फर्म	1969-70	50,57,319
			1970-71	90,57,319
24.	मै० राठी स्टील रोलिंग मिल्स (प्रा०) लि० पानी रोड, गाहदरा	क०	1970-71	20,24,970
25.	मै० शर्मा लि०, रोशनआग रोड, दिल्ली	क०	1971-72	37,76,211
26.	मै० मिह इन्जीनियरिंग वर्क्स (प्रा०) लि०, जी० टी० रोड, कानपुर	क०	1970-71	25,68,810
			1971-72	49,76,600
27.	मै० सनफीबर सेल्स कारपोरेशन, मांसी नगर	प० फर्म	1970-71	10,44,000
28.	मै० यू० बी० एम० पब्लिशर्स इस्टीमेटर्स 5-वरियागंज अन्मारी रोड, दिल्ली	अ० प० फर्म	1970-71	25,40,660
29.	मै० यूनीवर्सल बुक स्टाल, 97-वी माल, कानपुर	प० फर्म०	1970-71	27,20,630
30.	मै० उष्य चन्द पुरन मल, ए-14/3, आमफ अखी रोड, नई दिल्ली	अ० प० फर्म०	1967-68	18,13,556
			1970-71	20,00,000

पी० एल० मलहोत्रा,  
आयकर आयुक्त

### OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 8th April, 1974.

S.O. 1061.—As authorised and directed by the Central Government Govt. of India, Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance) New Delhi's order F.No. 16/202/67-JTB dated 25-3-1969, in terms of Section, 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the names and other specified particulars relating to assessee's :

(i) being Individuals or Hindu Undivided Families, who have been assessed on an income of more than one lakh of rupees;  
(ii) being Firms, Association of Persons or Companies who have been assessed on an income of more than ten lakhs of rupees;  
assessed during the Financial Year 1972-73 are hereby published.

I. Names of all Indls. and HUFs who have been assessed on an income of Rs. 1 lakh or more during the Financial Year 1972-73

Sl. No.	Name and Address of the assessee	Status	Assessment Year	Total income assessed
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Smt. Asha Rani Soni, c/o M/s. Bedi Woollen & Silk Mills, Industrial Area-A, Ludhiana.	Indl.	1970-71	Rs. 2,55,605
2.	Sh. Anil Mohan Gupta, c/o M/s. Auto Sales, P. D. Tandon Road, Allaha-bad.	Indl.	1970-71	1,01,790

1	2	3	4	5
3.	Sh. Ajay Gupta through Shri H. C. Gupta, Commercial Motors Building, 11, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Lucknow.	Indl.	1970-71	Rs. 3,26,118
4.	Shri B. D. Gupta, c/o M/s. Jaswant Sugar Mills, Meerut.	HUF	1970-71	16,29,760
5.	Shri Brij Mohan Gupta, c/o M/s. Auto Sales, P. D. Tandon Road, Allahabad.	Indl.	1970-71	1,06,120
6.	Shri Bal Chand Soni, c/o M/s. R. K. Machine Tools, Ludhiana.	Indl.	1970-71	18,05,890
7.	S. Baldev Singh Bawa, 35, Rajpur Road, Delhi.	Indl.	1956-57	1,56,350
8.	S. Balwant Singh Bawa, 35, Rajpur Road, Delhi.	Indl.	1955-56	4,51,586
9.	Bakshi Abdul Majid, Pamposh Hotel, Residency Road, Srinagar.	Indl.	1970-71	4,48,440
10.	Bakshi Bashir Ahmed, P/O M/s. Fairdeal Motors, Residency Road, Srinagar.	Indl.	1963-64 1970-71	1,32,540 1,65,790
11.	Babek Singh & Sons, 12, Roshanara Road, Delhi.	HUF	1960-61	10,9,490
12.	Shri Charan Dass, c/o M/s. Jagtunal Kundan Lal, Patiala.	Indl.	1972-73	1,01,120
13.	Shri Charanjit Singh c/o S. Mohan Singh Building, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.	Indl.	1972-73	3,88,761
14.	Shri C. M. Chawla, c/o M/s. Universal Book Stall, 97, The Mall, Kanpur.	Indl.	1970-71	7,14,300
15.	Shri Chhail Behari Lal, c/o M/s. K. N. Ahuja & S. K. Chatrath, 39-NDSE, New Delhi.	Indl.	1967-68	1,01,906
16.	M/s. Dharambir, Bhutla Parao, Haldwani.	HUF	1970-71	1,78,589
17.	Shri Duli Chand, A-14/3, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1968-69 1969-70 1970-71	3,85,357 3,40,170 5,86,487
18.	Shri D. R. Mago, c/o M/s. Jagat Ram & Sons, 49, Qutab Road Delhi.	Indl.	1956-57	2,77,558
19.	S. Daljit Singh, c/o S. Mohan Singh Building, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.	Indl.	1969-70	1,87,789
20.	R. B. Seth G. M. Modi, Modinagar.	Indl.	1970-71	2,23,752
21.	Shri Gunjan Gupta, Commercial Motors Building, 11-Hazarat Ganj, Lucknow.	Indl.	1970-71	1,22,530
22.	Shri Gauri Shankar, P/o M/s. P. M. Motor & General Finance Co., A-14/3, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1969-70 1970-71	1,22,340 2,48,339
23.	Shri Gauri Shankar, C-6/4, Model Town, Delhi.	HUF	1970-71	2,54,225
24.	Shri G. S. Puri, R-619, Model Town, Jullunder.	Indl.	1962-63	1,01,584
25.	Shri H. P. Nanda, 12, Jor Bagh, New Delhi.	Indl.	1971-72 1972-73	2,29,942 2,80,223
26.	Shri H. P. Nanda & Sons, 12, Jor Bagh, New Delhi.	HUF	1971-72	1,16,591
27.	Shri Hirdey Narain Goel, Beharipur, Bareilly.	HUF	1958-59	1,35,300
28.	Shri Hirdey Narain Goel, Beharipur, Bareilly.	Indl.	1958-59	1,35,000
29.	Shri Hari Kishan Rathi, Loni Road, Shahdara.	HUF	1970-71	1,34,030
30.	Shri Hukam Chand Gupta, Commercial Motors Building, 11-Hazarat Ganj, Lucknow.	Indl.	1970-71	1,77,650
31.	Shri Hari Raj Swarup, Muzaffar Nagar.	Indl.	1969-70	1,16,720
32.	S. Inder Singh, C/o M/s. Singh Engg. Works (P) Ltd., G. T. Road, Kanpur.	Indl.	1972-73	2,14,120
33.	Shri Inder Narain, c/o M/s. Eastern Arts Corpn., Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	HUF	1971-72	1,55,671
34.	Shri Jagdish Rai Jain, c/o M/s. Jain Bros., Hauz Qazi Delhi.	Indl.	1971-72	1,51,893
35.	Shri Jagdish Prashad, c/o M/s. Eastern Arts Corpn., Asaf Ali Road, Delhi.	Indl.	1971-72	1,44,667
36.	Shri Jagdish Rai Jain, 110-D, Kamla Nagar, New Delhi.	HUF	1963-64 1964-65 1965-66	1,35,741 2,97,834 2,27,251
37.	Shri Jagat Kumar Sethia, Prop. M/s. Assam Bengal Tea Agency, 2285, Gali Hirza Beg, Tilak Bazar, Khari Baoli, Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	2,00,000
38.	Seth K. N. Modi, Modi Nagar.	Indl.	1970-71	1,04,453
39.	Shri Kamalesh Kumar Rathi, Loni Road, Shahdara.	Indl.	1967-68	1,31,648
40.	Smt. K. Shanisher Singh, 13-F, Connaught Place, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	1,44,781

1	2	3	4	5 -
41.	Shri Kailash Lamba, Punchkuian Road, Delhi.	Indl.	1963-64	1,71,510
42.	Shri K. P. Singh, 14, Aurangzeb Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	1,03,379
43.	Shri L. P. Jaiswal, 54, Ring Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1963-64	2,30,310
44.	Shri Lakshmi Narain, A-14/3, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	1,62,300
45.	Pt. Lila Ram, 279, Masjid Moth, New Delhi.	HUF	1970-71	9,29,470
46.	M/s. Mansa Ram & Sons, 3/1, Convent Road, Dehradun.	HUF	1946-47	5,43,835
			1948-49	1,35,050
			1949-50	1,79,184
			1951-52	1,67,560
			1952-53	6,26,930
			1953-54	3,06,130
			1955-56	1,03,940
			1965-66	3,02,860
			1969-70	1,70,630
			1970-71	3,38,000
			1971-72	1,08,000
47.	Shri Man Mohan Gupta, c/o M/s. Auto Sales, P. D. Tandon Road, Allahabad.	Indl.	1970-71	1,45,730
48.	Shri Manohar Lal, 57, Rajpur Road, Dehradun.	Indl.	1970-71	2,19,864
49.	Shri M. L. Narang, 16-A, Sunder Nagar Market, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	8,99,655
50.	Smt. Masuda Begum, Munir Manzil, Lambert Lane, Srinagar.	Indl.	1970-71	2,32,060
51.	Mohd. Yunus, P/O M/s. Shama Magazine, 12-13, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	1,21,789
52.	Mohd. Yusuf, P/O M/s. Shama Magazine, 12-13, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	1,58,757
53.	Shri Madan Lamba, c/o M/s. Volga Restaurant, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	2,34,530
			1971-72	1,70,217
			1972-73	2,47,172
54.	Smt. Nirmala Gupta, c/o M/s. Hotel Tourist, Ram Nagar, New Delhi.	Indl.	1972-73	1,11,784
55.	Shri Niranjan Lal Jain, c/o M/s. Jain Bros., Hauz Quzi, Delhi.	Indl.	1971-72	1,52,086
56.	Shri N. K. Soni c/o M/s. Bedi Woollen & Silk Mills, Industrial Area-A, Ludhiana.	Indl.	1970-71	16,87,025
57.	Shri O. P. Narang, 16-A, Sunder Nagar Market, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	2,98,768
58.	Smt. Prito Devi c/o M/s. Jagtunal Kundan Lal, Patiala.	Indl.	1972-73	1,04,850
59.	Shri Padam Chand, c/o M/s. Eastern Art Corpn., Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	1,70,665
			1960-61	5,26,120
60.	Shri Pooran Mal, 12-E, Kamala Nagar, Delhi.	Indl.	1967-68	17,27,080
			1968-69	17,16,000
			1969-70	20,20,000
			1970-71	24,20,000
61.	Shri Prem Raj, 279, Masjid Moth, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	1,18,914
62.	Seth Puran Chand, 5, Curzon Road, New Delhi.	HUF	1970-71	16,81,090
63.	Smt. Raj Rani, c/o Hotel Tourist, Ram Nagar, New Delhi.	Indl.	1972-73	1,23,279
64.	Shri Ravinder Kumar Gupta, P/O M/s. S. Chand & Co., New Delhi.	Indl.	1971-72	1,65,680
65.	Shri R. K. Gupta, P/O M/s. Chand & Co., New Delhi.	Indl.	1971-72	2,00,570
			1972-73	1,24,561
66.	Shri Rania Nand Jain, c/o M/s. Jain Bros., Hauz Quzi, Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	1,37,790
			1971-72	2,06,944
67.	Shri R. K. Soni, c/o M/s. Bedi Woollen & Silk Mills, Industrial Area-A, Ludhiana.	Indl.	1970-71	16,76,629
68.	Shri R. L. Narang, 16-A, Sunder Nagar Market, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	8,16,297
69.	Shri Roshan Lal (Deceased) A-14/3, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1969-70	1,88,577
			1970-71	3,54,377
70.	Shri Rajan Vinayak, Bhutia Parao, Haldwani.	Indl.	1970-71	2,78,159
71.	Shri R. Dalmia, 10-Darya Ganj, Delhi.	Indl.	1953-54	7,77,610
			1957-58	27,67,874
			1960-61	52,71,590
			1970-71	1,61,125
72.	Shri Rajendra Lal through Smt. Vimla Rani, Meerut.	HUF	1970-71	20,14,970
73.	Raj Kumari Gupta, 23, Ashok Marg, Lucknow.	Indl.	1970-71	1,14,950
74.	Shri Surendra Kumar, c/o M/s. Indian Implements Mfg. Co., Marris Road, Aligarh.	Indl.	1967-68	1,26,430
			1968-69	1,42,110

1	2	3	4	5
75.	Shri Sudhir Kumar, Sudhir Niketan, Marris Road, Aligarh.	Indl.	1970-71	1,37,950
76.	Smt. Sarla Kapoor, Sudhir Niketan, Marris Road, Aligarh.	Indl.	1970-71	1,35,820
77.	Shri Shamsher Singh, 13-F, Connaught Place, New Delhi.	Indl.	1967-68 1968-69 1969-70 1970-71 1971-72	1,31,191 1,74,528 2,11,570 1,42,901 1,77,698
78.	Shri S. L. Gupta, P/O M/s. S. Chand & Co., Now Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71 1971-72	1,18,026 1,92,164
79.	Shri S. R. Jain, C/o M/s. Jain Bros., Hauz Quazi, Delhi.	Indl.	1972-73	1,25,430
80.	Shri Shyam Lal, c/o M/s. Jagtumul Kundan Lal, Patiala.	Indl.	1972-73	1,01,871
81.	Shri Sanjiv Kumar, c/o Kiran Cinema, Chandigarh.	Indl.	1970-71 1971-72 1970-71	1,92,930 1,73,465 1,88,111
82.	Shri T. P. Khatan, c/o M/s. Amrit Banaspati Co. Ltd., G. T. Road, Ghazibad.	Indl.	1970-71 1971-72 1970-71	2,15,200 16,83,942 2,29,646
83.	Mrs. Usha Narain, c/o M/s. East Art Knitwear, Asaf Ali Road, Now Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	
84.	Shri Vijay Parshad, c/o M/s. East Art Knitwear, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	
85.	Shri V. K. Soni, c/o M/s. Bedi Woolcn & Silk Mills, Industrial Area-A, Ludhiana.	Indl.	1970-71	
86.	Shri V. H. Dalmia, 4, Scindia House, New Delhi.	Indl.	1970-71	
<b>II. Name of Firms, AOPs and Companies who have been assessed on an income of more than ten lakhs of rupees—</b>				
1.	M/s. Auto Sales, P. D. Tandon Road, Allahabad.	URF	1970-71	10,08,260
2.	M/s. Anchor pressings (P) Ltd. Marris Road, Aligarh.	Co.	1970-71	12,12,800
3.	M/s. Bharat Nidhi Ltd., 7, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi.	Co.	1972-73	14,19,340
4.	M/s. Chaman Estate (P) Ltd., 167, P. D. Mello Road, Bombay.	Co.	1961-62	12,16,369
5.	M/s. Dalmia Dadri Cement Ltd. 10, Darya Ganj, Delhi.	Co.	1970-71	33,99,615
6.	M/s. Dalmia Cement (Bharat) Ltd., 4, Scindia House, New Delhi.	Co.	1970-71	1,66,31,270
7.	M/s. Dalmia Cement Ltd., 4, Scindia House, New Delhi.	Co.	1972-73	55,28,670
8.	M/s. Dharam Singh Ram Singh, 12-Roshanara Road, Delhi.	RF	1955-56 1956-57 1969-70 1970-71	21,32,350 16,17,770 1,35,37,040 1,54,43,256
9.	M/s. Escorts Ltd., Roshanara Road, Delhi.	Co.	1970-71 1971-72	37,90,322 48,48,942 67,93,308
10.	M/s. Goetze (India) Ltd., Roshanara Road, Delhi.	Co.	1970-71 1971-72 1972-73	15,97,499 18,37,345
11.	M/s. Golcha Properties (P) Ltd., (In liquidation), Jaipur.	Co.	1969-70 1970-71	14,00,000 30,00,000
12.	M/s. Ganesh Flour Mills Co. Ltd., Subzi Mandi, Delhi.	Co.	1970-71	10,60,904
13.	M/s. Hari Bros. (P) Ltd., 4, Scindia House, New Delhi.	Co.	1957-58 1958-59 1959-60 1970-71	14,47,212 12,24,010 13,94,264 42,86,650
14.	M/s. Hirdey Narain Suraj Parkash, Beharipur. Bareilly.	Firm	1969-70 1970-71 1971-72	70,27,542 39,02,840 28,10,834 44,54,528
15.	M/s. Jaswant Sugar Mills Ltd., Meerut.	Co.	1970-71	11,92,920
16.	M/s. Jaipur Udyog Ltd., Jaipur.	Co.	1962-63 1963-64 1964-65 1965-66 1966-67 1967-68 1968-69 1970-71	48,86,710 45,65,616 26,64,572 30,99,562 53,74,703 55,69,330 23,83,260 10,13,974
17.	M/s. Jagatjit Industries Ltd., 54, Ring Road, New Delhi.	Co.	1970-71	69,10,352
18.	M/s. Kundan Sugar Mills (P) Ltd., Amroha.	Co.	1970-71	1,68,54,900
19.	M/s. Modi Spg. & Wvg. Mills Co. Ltd., Modi Nagar.	Co.	1970-71	1,01,05,714
20.	M/s. Modi Industries Co. Ltd., Modinagar.	Co.	1969-70 1970-71	50,57,319 90,57,319
21.	M/s. Modipon Ltd., Modi Nagar.	Co.	1970-71	20,24,970
22.	M/s. Orissa Cement Ltd., 4, Scindia House, New Delhi.	Co.	1971-72	37,76,211
23.	M/s. R. K. Machine Tools, Industrial Area, Ludhiana.	RF	1970-71 1971-72	25,68,810 49,76,600
24.	M/s. Rathi Steel Rolling Mills (P) Ltd., Loni Road, Shahdara.	Co.	1970-71	10,44,000
25.	M/s. Sharpedge Ltd., Roshanara Road, Delhi.	Co.	1970-71	25,40,660
26.	M/s. Singh Engg. Works (P) Ltd., G. T. Road, Kanpur.	Co.	1970-71 1967-68 1970-71	27,20,630 18,13,556 20,00,000
27.	M/s. Sunjibere Sales Corpn., Modinagar.	RF		
28.	M/s. U. B. S. Publishers Distributors, 5, Darya Ganj, Ansari Road, Delhi.	URF		
29.	M/s. Universal Book Stall, 97, The Mall, Kanpur.	RF		
30.	M/s. Udey Chand Puran Mal, A-14/3, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi.	URF		

[F No. SI/PN/2)C/73-74]

P. L. Malhotra

Commissioner of Income-tax  
Delhi (Central) New Delhi.

**वाणिज्य मंत्रालय****मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली****आदेश**

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 1974

**क्र० प्रा० 1062.**—यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुये गर्बश्री फैक्ट इंजी० एंड डिजाइन आर्गेनाइजेशन दि कटिलाइजर्स एंड केमिकल्स ट्रावन्कोर लि० उद्योग मंडल वाया कोचीन को 3,96,000 रु० (तीन लाख छियात्तये हजार रु० मात्र) के लिए जारी किए गए सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट को एनद् द्वारा रद्द किया जाता है। मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट का उपयोग 3,80,000 रु० (तीन लाख अस्सी हजार रुपये मात्र) के लिये किया गया था।

रद्द करने का कारण यह है कि सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा खो गया/अस्थानस्थ हो गया है और उन्होंने इस के बदले में अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क निकासी परमिट जारी करने का अनुरोध किया है। [संख्या सी जी 2/पी एंड सी (49) /72-73]

**MINISTRY OF COMMERCE****(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)****ORDER**

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1974

**S.O. 1062.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended, the undersigned hereby cancels the Customs Clearance Permit No. G/I/2442442/Q/NG/44/H/35-36 dated 23-8-1972 for Rs. 3,96,000 (Rupees Three Lakhs, Ninety Six thousand only) issued to Messrs Fact Engineering and Design Organisation—The Fertilisers and Chemicals Travancore Ltd., Udyogmandal via Cochin. The original Customs Clearance Permit was utilised for Rs. 3,80,000 (Three Lakhs & Eighty Thousand only).

2. The reason for the cancellation is that the Customs Clearance Permit has been lost/misplaced by the licensee, who had requested for the issue of a duplicate CCP in lieu thereof.

[No. CG II/P&amp;C(49)/72-73]

**आदेश**

नई दिल्ली, 10 अप्रैल, 1974

**क्र० प्रा० 1063.**—यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रक) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करने हुये अधो-हस्ताक्षरी मुख्य ऋण अधिकारी, व्यास ऋण संस्था, तलवाड़ा, टाउनशिप (पंजाब) को जारी किये गये 22,000/- रुपये (बाईस हजार रुपये मात्र) मूल्य के आयात लाइसेंस सं० जी/ए/ 1057386/आर/ आई ए/ 44/एच/35:36/सी जी-2 दिनांक 27-9-1972 की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति को एनद् द्वारा रद्द करता है। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति का बिल्कुल भी उपयोग नहीं किया गया था।

रद्द करने का कारण यह है कि लाइसेंस की सीमाशुल्क निकासी प्रति लाइसेंसधारी से खो गई है जिसके बदले उसने लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिये आवेदन किया था।

[संख्या : सी जी-2/आई एन पी (120)/72-73]

चन्द्र गुप्त, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

**ORDER**

New Delhi, the 10th April, 1974

**S.O. 1063.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import Control Order, 1955, dated 7-12-1955 as amended the under-signed hereby cancels the customs pur-

poses copy of Import licence No. G/Δ/1057386/R/IA/44/H/35-36/C/GII dated 27-9-1972 for Rs. 22,000 (Rupees twenty two thousand only) issued to the Chief Purchase Officer, Beas Purchase Organisation, Talwara Township (Punjab). The original Customs Purpose copy of the licence was not utilised at all.

2. The reason for the cancellation is that the customs purposes copy of the licence has been lost/misplaced by the licensee, who has requested for the issue of a duplicate licence in lieu thereof.

[No. CGII/I&amp;P/(120)/72-73/50]

CHANDRA GUPTA, Dy. Chief Controller

**आदेश**

**क्र० प्रा० 1064.**—वि प्रोजेक्ट्स एंड इक्विपमेंट्स कॉर्पोरेशन आफ इंडिया, लि० नई दिल्ली को जर्मन जनवादी गणराज्य से परिणद्धि एवं भाषण औजारों के आयात के लिये 10,00,000 रु० का एक लाइसेंस सं० जी० टी० /2391052 दिनांक 22-2-72 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबंधी प्रति के लिये इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबंधी प्रति खो गई/अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा आगे यह बताया गया है कि लाइसेंस बम्बई पत्तन में पंजीकृत कराया गया है। उनके द्वारा आगे यह भी बताया गया है कि लाइसेंस में शेष 9,88,560 रु० को छोड़ कर उसका 11,410 रु० के लिए अंशतः उपयोग कर लिया गया है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक गवध पत्र वाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षर संयुक्त है कि लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/2391052 दिनांक 22-2-72 की मूल सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबंधी प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता है कि उन्हें उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबंधी प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिये। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबंधी प्रति एनद् द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

लाइसेंस सं० जी० टी० 2391052 दिनांक 22-2-72 की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क कार्यसंबंधी प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या एम टी सी/जी डी आर-46/71-72/आर एम सेल]

एम० के० उस्मानी

उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात

**ORDER**

**S.O. 1064.**—The Projects & Equipments Corporation of India Ltd., New Delhi were granted licence No. G/T/2391052 dated 22-2-1972 for the Import of Precision and Measuring Tools from G.D.R. to the value of Rs. 10,00,000. They have requested for the issue of duplicate Customs purposes copy of the above licence on the ground that the Original Custom copy of the above licence has been lost/misplaced by them. It has been further reported by the licensee that the licence has been registered with Bombay port. It has been further stated by them that the licence has been partly utilised to the value of Rs. 11,440 leaving a balance of Rs. 9,88,560.

In support of their contention the applicant have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the Original Customs copy of the licence No. G/T/2391052 dated 22-2-1972 has been lost and direct that Duplicate Custom Copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The Original Custom Copy of the licence is hereby cancelled.

The duplicate Customs Copy of the licence No. G/T/2391052 dated 22-2-1972 is being issued separately.

[F. No. STC/GDR-46/71-72/RM Cell]  
MISS S. K. USMANI, Dy. Chief Controller

Import &amp; Exports.

## औद्योगिक विकास विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिक मंत्रालय

## भारतीय मानक संस्था

नई दिल्ली, 11 अप्रैल, 1974

क्र० प्रा० 1065.—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन विज्ञान) विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 8 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि नीचे अनुसूची में विशिष्ट सहित दिए गए 172 आइटमों का नवीकरण माह अक्टूबर, 1972 में किया गया है :—

## अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाहमें संख्या और तिथि	वैधता की अवधि से	तक	लाहमेंधारी का नाम और पता	लाहमें के अधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया तथा तत्सम्बन्धी IS : पदनाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	सी एम/एल-15 13-9-1956	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	बम्बई सर्वार्थ विजेज इण्डस्ट्रीज एसोसियेशन, पल्लव सेक्शन, ग्राम उद्योग बाड़ी, 38/42 डॉक्याई रोड, बम्बई-10 बीडी ।	भारत का राष्ट्रीय ध्वज (सूती खादी)— IS : 1-1968
2.	सी एम/एल-20 24-10-1956	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	श्री विविजय सीमेंट कं० लि०, मिक्का बरास्ता जामनगर (गुजरात) ।	साधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट— IS : 269-1967
3.	सी एम/एल-104 7-10-1958	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	ई आई डी पेरी लि०, नेलीकुप्पम्, दक्षिण आर्काट जिला (तमिलनाडु)	परिशोधित स्पिरिट ग्रेड-1— IS : 323-1959
4.	सी एम/एल-141 24-9-1959	1-10-1971	30-9-1973	टाटा फायशन इण्डस्ट्रीज लि०, 20 हावड़ा रोड, मलिकया कलकत्ता	डी डी टी धूलन पाउडर— IS : 564-1961
5.	सी एम/एल-142 24-9-1959	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	बी एच सी धूलन पाउडर— IS : 561-1962
6.	सी एम/एल-168 22-2-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	बी एच सी जल विसर्जनीय धूलन पाउडर— IS : 562-1962
7.	सी एम/एल-200 15-6-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्वराइजिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, 589-निरुबोत्तियूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	डी डी टी धूलन पाउडर— IS : 564-1961
8.	सी एम/एल-201 15-6-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	डी डी टी जलविसर्जनीय तेज चूर्ण— IS : 565-1961
9.	सी एम/एल-202 15-6-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्वराइजिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, 589-निरुबोत्तियूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	बी एच सी धूलन पाउडर— IS : 561-1962
10.	सी एम/एल-204 28-6-1960	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	जयपुर मेटल एण्ड इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लि०, रेलवे- स्टेशन के समीप, जयपुर-6	व्यापार की टंक के लिए तांबे की छड़ें— IS : 288-1960
11.	सी एम/एल-217 21-8-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	टाटा फायशन इण्डस्ट्रीज, 20 हावड़ा रोड, मलिकया, कलकत्ता	डी डी टी जलविसर्जनीय तेज चूर्ण— IS : 565-1961
12.	सी एम/एल-302 25-5-1961	1-9-1972	31-8-1973	नेशनल प्लास्टिक्स इण्डस्ट्रीज, 6-गौरपाड़ा सरकार लेन, कलकत्ता-4	बाय की वेदिया के लिए प्लास्टिक के नली— IS : 10-1970
13.	सी एम/एल-338 1-9-1961	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	इण्डो-एशिया ट्रेडर्स प्रा० लि०, नकोदर रोड, जलंधर शहर	15-एम्पी वाले धातु चूड़े स्विच— IS : 4064-1967
14.	सी एम/एल-343 27-9-1961	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	एस० जी० सेन फैक्टरी, यमुनानगर, रेलवे स्टेशन जगाधरी, जिला अम्बाला	18-मीटर समायी वाले वर्गकार टिन— IS : 916-1966
15.	सी एम/एल-348 11-10-1961	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	दि मालवा वनस्पति एण्ड केमिकल्स कं० लि०, भगीरथपुरा, इन्दौर	18-मीटर समायी वाले वर्गकार टिन— IS : 916-1966
16.	सी एम/एल-365 12-12-1961	1-1-1972	31-12-1972	डिज्ज इलेक्ट्रिकल्स (इण्डिया) लि०, 29- मल्कागंज रोड, दिल्ली	घरेलू उपयोग के लिए बिजली के मुवाह्य पानी में डुबाऊ हीटर (500 वाट से 4000 वाट की क्षमता तक)— IS : 368-1963



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
17. सी एम/एल-367 15-12-1961	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्बराहजिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, 589- निस्कोत्तियूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	एन्क्रिप्ट पायसनीय द्रव— IS : 1310-1958	
18. सी एम/एल-451 13-8-1962	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	कोयम्बटूर प्रीमियर कारपोरेशन प्रा० लि०, पटेल मार्ग, कोयम्बटूर-9	तीन फेजी प्रेरण मोटर 7.5 कि वा (10 हा पा) तक 'ए' श्रेणी के रोधन वाले— IS : 325-1961	
19. सी एम/एल-501 23-1-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	टाटा फायशन इण्डस्ट्रीज, 20-हावड़ा रोड, सल्लिकिया, कलकत्ता	एन्क्रिप्ट पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS : 1310-1958	
20. सी एम/एल-539 13-5-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	सी ओ सी जलविसर्जनीय तेज पाउडर— IS : 1507-1959	
21. सी एम/एल-577 11-9-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्बराहजिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, 1074- निस्कोत्तियूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	पैराथियोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS : 2129-1962	
22. सी एम/एल-580 11-9-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	कोल्लनूर पेन्ट, कलर एण्ड धागिषा वर्क्स, छेहरटा, अमृतसर	(क) बाहर रंग करने के लिए संश्लिष्ट इनैमल, टाइप-1 IS : 2932-1964 (ख) बाहर रंग करने के लिए इनैमल, टाइप 2 IS : 2933-1964 (3) भीतरी रंग के लिए इनैमल— IS : 133-1964	
23. सी एम/एल-613 31-12-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	वि नेशनल रोलिंग एण्ड स्टील रोल्स लि०, शामनगर-24 परगना (प० बंगाल)	(क) खानों में बुनार्ई के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्से— IS : 1856-1970 (ख) खानों में लिपटार्ई के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्से— IS : 1855-1961	
24. सी एम/एल-616 7-1-1964	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	जयपुर मेटल एण्ड इलेक्ट्रिकल्स लि०, रेनवे स्टेशन के समीप, जयपुर-6	शिरोपरि पावर प्रेषण कार्यों के लिए सख्त खिंचे लकड़दार एलुमिनियम की कोर वाले एलुमिनियम जालक— IS : 398-1961	
25. सी एम/एल-683 17-6-1964	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	इन्दौर स्टील एण्ड आयरन मिल्स, 314- भगीरथपुरा, इन्दौर शहर (म० प्र०)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)— IS : 226-1969	
26. सी एम/एल-684 17-6-1964	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	„	संरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म)— IS : 1977-1969	
27. सी एम/एल-701 26-6-1964	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	गोदरेज सोप प्रा० लि०, बिखरौली, बम्बई-79	स्टियरिक अम्ल, तकनीकी— IS : 1675-1960 ग्रांलीक अम्ल, तकनीकी— IS : 1676-1960	
28. सी एम/एल-720 29-6-1964	1-8-1972	31-7-1973	माडन इण्डस्ट्रीज, साहिवाबाद, गाजियाबाद (उ० प्र०)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)— IS : 226-1969	
29. सी एम/एल-721 29-6-1964	1-8-1972	31-7-1973	„	संरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म)— IS : 1977-1969	
30. सी एम/एल-724 29-6-1964	1-8-1972	31-7-1973	किसान इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स प्रा० लि०, दनकौर स्टेशन, उत्तर रेलवे जिला बुलन्दशहर (उ० प्र०)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)— IS : 226-1969	
31. सी एम/एल-725 29-6-1964	1-8-1972	31-7-1973	किसान इंजीनियरिंग वर्क्स प्रा० लि०, दनकौर स्टेशन, उत्तर रेलवे, जिला बुलन्दशहर (उ० प्र०)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)— IS : 226-1969	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
32. सी एम/एल-776 28-9-1964	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	भागमन्स पेन्ट इण्डस्ट्रीज (इण्डिया) लि०, डी एल एफ इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, नई दिल्ली-15	धातु के मांकों पर लगने वाली पट्टियाँ— IS : 419-1967	
33. सी एम/एल-782 17-9-1964	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	हिन्दुस्तान वायर लिमिटेड, बी टी रोड, झाकधर मुकुन्दर जिला 24 परगना (पं० बंगाल)	पूर्व प्रचलित कंसीट के लिए मादी मखन खिचे इस्पात के तार— IS : 1785 (भाग 1)-1966	
34. सी एम/एल-792 30-9-1964	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	„	शिरोपरिपावर प्रेषण कार्यों के लिए इस्पात की कोर वाले एलुमिनियम चालकों के लिए इस्पात के तार— IS : 398-1961	
35. सी एम/एल-793 30-9-1964	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	नेशनल स्टील वर्क्स लि०, वार्डेन हाउस (पहली मंजिल) सर फिरोजशाह मेहता रोड, फोर्ट, बम्बई	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)— IS : 226-1969	
36. सी एम/एल-794 30-9-1964	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	नेशनल स्टील वर्क्स लि०, वार्डेन हाउस (पहली मंजिल) सर फिरोजशाह मेहता रोड, फोर्ट, बम्बई	संरचना इस्पात (माधुराण किस्म)— IS : 1977-1969	
37. सी एम/एल-1050 31-3-1965	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	कस्मीर मेरेमिक प्रॉडक्ट्स प्रा० लि०, एम बी रोड, गाँव मीरा बोरील्ली, बम्बई-92 (एन बी)	100 मिमी, 150 मिमी 200 मिमी और 300 मिमी व्यास के चमकदार अवण कांचाभ स्टोनवेयर के पाइप और फिटिंग IS : 651-1971	
38. सी एम/एल-1122 6-8-1965	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	साठनामाइड इण्डिया लि०, अमलु झाकधर, बरास्ता बलसर	मालाथियोन पायससीय तेज द्रव— IS : 2567-1963	
39. सी एम/एल-1144 14-9-1965	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	ग्रोटो पिन (इण्डिया) पंजीकृत प्लाट सं० 16-इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा)	स्वचल गाड़ियों के निरन्धन के लिए कमानियाँ और कमानियों की पत्तियाँ— IS : 1135-1966	
40. सी एम/एल-1150 4-10-1965	1-11-1972	30-9-1973	एणियन केबल्स कारपोरेशन लि०, पोखरन रोड, थाना (महाराष्ट्र)	पी बी सी रोधित बिजली के केबल (भारी ड्यूटी)-1100 बोल्ड तक की बोल्डता और तांबे तथा एलुमिनियम चालकों वाले— IS : 1554 (भाग 1)-1964	
41. सी एम/एल-1218 2-3-1966	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	यूनाइटेड वायर रोप्स लि०, मारुति कुमार रोड, पंचपखाड़ी-थाना (महाराष्ट्र)	(क) खानों में ड्रलाई के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्मे— IS : 1856-1970 (ख) खानों में लिफ्टाई के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्मे— IS : 1855-1961	
42. सी एम/एल-1227 11-3-1966	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	नाइन फाउण्ट्री लि०, नाहन (हि०प्र०)	तीन फेजी प्रेरण मोटर (केवल 15 हा पा तक)— IS : 325-1961	
43. सी एम/एल-1284 27-6-1966	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	दि नेशनल रोलिंग एण्ड स्टील रोप्स लि०, शामनगर-24 परगना (पं० बंगाल)	सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्मे— IS : 2266-1970	
44. सी एम/एल-1298 20-7-1966	16-7-1972	15-7-1973	मोदी स्टील्स, मोदी नगर (उ० प्र०)	सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिए मृदु इस्पात के तार— IS : 280-1972	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
45. सी एम/एल-1317 29-8-1966	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	हिन्दुस्तान वायर्स लि०, बी० टी० रोड, डाकघर सुकनर, जिला-24 परगना	कैबलों पर कवच चढ़ाने के लिए जस्ता जड़े इस्पात के तार— IS: 434 (भाग 2)-1964 और IS: 3975-1967	
46. सी एम/एल-1322 30-8-1966	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	मल्टीवेल्ड वायर कं० (प्रा०) लि०, मरोल मरोपी रोड, मरोल बम्बई-59	कंठ्रीट प्रबलन के लिए सख्त विद्युती इस्पात की महीन जाती— IS: 1566-1967	
47. सी एम/एल-1328 6-9-1966	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	एस० आर० पी० टूंस लि०, लैटिम ब्रिज, तिरुवान्मीयूर मद्रास-41	निम्न प्रकार के मिलिंग कटर— (क) सिरे वाले मिल (गावदुम और समानान्तर शीक वाले) एकसरा बने (ख) खोंच काटने के मिलिंग कटर, एक- सरा बने (ग) समानान्तर शीक सिरो वाले मिल, दो टुकड़ों में बने, टाइप एन, IS: 1830-1971	
48. सी एम/एल-1329 6-9-1966	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	„	(क) समानान्तर शीक वाले, एकसरा बने हाथ के रीमर— IS: 5444-1969 (ख) गावदुम शीक वाले जकों में लगने वाले रीमर, एकसरा और दो टुकड़ों में बने— IS: 5447-1969	
49. सी एम/एल-1340 30-9-1966	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	हेबराबाद ऐल्विन मेटल वर्क्स लि०, सनतनगर, हेबराबाद-18	श्वित पेट्रोपियम गैसों के भण्डारण और परिवहन के लिए मल्टि वाबन इस्पात के वेल्डकृत गैस रिलेण्डर— IS: 3196-1968	
50. सी एम/एल-3403 3-3-1967	16-3-1972	15-3-1973	इण्डियन मिनरल इण्डस्ट्रीज लि० ट्रेनिंग ग्राउण्ड ऐप्रोच रोड, भगरपाड़ा-24 परगना	बी एच सी जल विसर्जनीय पाउडर— IS: 562-1962	
51. सी एम/एल-1439 15-5-1967	16-10-1972	15-5-1973	सिधल पेस्टीसाइड्स, 9/122, मोतीबाग जमुनाबिज, आगरा	एलिडन धूलन पाउडर— IS: 1308-1958	
52. सी एम/एल-1510 8-9-1967	16-4-1972	15-3-1973	एसोसियेटेड वायर्स कण्ट्रक्टर्स कं० प्रा० लि०, टांडा रोड, जलंधर शहर (पंजाब)	शिरोपरि पावर प्रेषण कार्यो के लिए सख्त खिंचे लड़दार एलुमिनियम और इस्पात की कौर वाले एलुमिनियम के बालक— IS: 398-1961	
53. सी एम/एल-1517 15-9-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	जयलक्ष्मी फर्टिलाइजर्स, बैकटारायपुरम्, तमकू पश्चिम गोदावरी जिला (आन्ध्र प्रदेश)	बी एच सी धूलन पाउडर— IS: 561-1962	
54. सी एम/एल-1518 15-9-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	„	डी डी टी जल विसर्जनीय पाउडर— IS: 565-1961	
55. सी एम/एल-1519 15-9-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	„	बी एच सी जल विसर्जनीय पाउडर— IS: 562-1962 एलिडन पायसनीय तेज प्रब— IS: 1310-1958	
56. सी० एम०/एल०-1520 15-9-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	„	IS: 1310-1958	
57. सी एम/एल-1525 15-9-1967	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्वराइजिंग मिल्स (प्रा०) लि०, 1074, तिरुवोत्तियूर हार्ड रोड, मद्रास-19	ताम्र ऑक्सीक्लोगाइड विसर्जनीय पाउडर— IS: 1507-1966	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
58. सी एम/एल-1530 26-9-1967	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	बारन मेटल इण्डस्ट्रीज लि०, एच ब्लॉक, हाइड रोड, सिविलपुर कलकत्ता-43	चाय की पेटियों के लिए धातु के फिटिंग— IS : 10-1970	
59. सी एम/एल-1531 26-9-1967	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	खेतान सन्स एण्ड कम्पनी (टी-वेस्ट) लि०, 34-बी टी रोड, कासीपुर, कलकत्ता-2	चाय की पेटियों के लिए धातु के फिटिंग— IS : 10-1970	
60. सी एम/एल-1545 9-10-1967	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	एल्टेक्स इंजीनियरी कारपोरेशन प्रा० लि०, कृष्णरायपुरम् रोड, गणपति डाकघर, कोयम्बटूर-6	तीन फेजी प्रेरण मोटर 2.2 कि० वा० (3 हा पा) 3.7 कि० वा० (5 हा पा) 5.5 कि० वा० (7.5 हा पा) और 7.5 कि० वा० (10 हा पा) 'ए' श्रेणी के रोधन वाली— IS : 325-1961	
61. सी एम/एल-1566 24-11-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	कीनपेस्टीसाइन्स (प्रा.) लि०, इण्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट मुडीकल डाकघर (बरास्ता) पेरम्बूर (केरल)	बी एच सी जल विसर्जनीय पाउडर— IS : 562-1962	
62. सी एम/एल-1666 1-4-1968	1-10-1972	31-8-1973	युनाइटेड पुलवराइजर्स, बोदला, आगरा-7	बी एच सी धूंसन पाउडर— IS : 561-1962	
63. सी एम/एल-1730 28-6-1968	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	बम्बई वायर रोप्स लि०, कोलगेट रोड, थाना (महाराष्ट्र)	(क) आनों में लिपटाई के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्से— IS : 1855-1961 (ख) आनों में बुलाई कार्यों के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्से— IS : 1856-1970	
64. सी एम/एल-1778 30-8-1968	1-11-1972	30-4-1973	राज गुप्त इण्डस्ट्रीज, 135-मालवीय नगर भोपाल-3	रंग रोगन और वानिश के लिए अपटे गुण केवल 12 मिमी से 50 मिमी तक के— IS : 384-1964	
65. सी एम/एल-1781 30-8-1968	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	चेट्टीनाडु सीमेंट कारपोरेशन लि०, पुलियार सीमेंट फेक्टरी डाकघर, करूर तालुक, ज़िला तिरुची (तमिलनाडु)	साधारण पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट— IS : 269-1967	
66. सी एम/एल-1789 16-9-1968	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	बर्मा शेल आयल स्टोरेज एण्ड डिस्ट्रीब्यूटिंग क० प्रा० इण्डिया लि०, बर्मा शेल हाउस, बैलर्ड इस्टेट, बम्बई-1	हेक्सेन खाद्य ग्रेड— IS : 3470-1966	
67. सी एम/एल-1792 16-9-1968	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	वि ओदियार पॉटरी वर्क्स लि०, सम्मुख रेलवे स्टेशन सिहोर (गुजरात)	सफाई सम्बन्धी कांचाभ संसोधन (चीनी मिट्टी के) IS : 2556 (भाग 2 से 6 और 10 तक)	
68. सी एम/एल-1799 25-9-1968	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	वि एग्रो इण्डस्ट्रियल एण्ड केमिकल्स क०, 13-ए, कल्याणी विद्यु, रुद्रपुर, जिला मैनीताल (उ०प्र०)	एम्ब्रिन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS : 1310-1908	
69. सी एम/एल-1801 27-9-1968	1-9-1972	31-8-1973	अग्रवाल मेटल वर्क्स प्रा० लि०, अग्रवाल रोड, रिवाड़ी (हरयाणा)	बर्तनों वाली पतियों के अलावा बेलित पीतल की चद्दरे, 0.5 मिमी से ऊपर मोटाई वाली, पदनाम Cu Zn 37 IS : 410-1967	
70. सी एम/एल-1802 4-10-1968	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	बम्बई वायर रोप्स लि०, कोलगेट रोड थाना (महाराष्ट्र)	सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्से— IS : 2266-1970	
71. सी एम/एल-1814 15-10-1968	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	ला० सबनलाल (एलुमिनियम) प्रा० लि०, 2-हरेन मुखर्जी रोड, बेलूर (हावड़ा)	एलुमिनियम के बर्तन ग्रेड एस आई सी IS : 21-1959	
72. सी एम/एल-1817 15-10-1968	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	बम्बई वायर रोप्स लि०, कोलगेट रोड थाना (महाराष्ट्र)	एलुमिनियम चालकों की इस्पात की कोर के लिए इस्पात के तार— IS : 398-1961	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
73. सी एम/एल-1824 31-10-1968	1-11-1972	30-4-1973	हिम पादन इण्डस्ट्रीज, हर्गवाला, जिला देहरादून (उ०प्र०)	चाय के पेटियों के लिए प्लास्टिक के पट्टियाँ— IS : 10-1970	
74. सी एम/एल-1839 22-11-1968	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	वि एग्री इण्डस्ट्रियल केमिकल्स कं०, 13-ए कल्याणी थियू रुद्रपुर जिला नैनीताल	एड्रिन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS : 1307-1958	
75. सी एम/एल-1865 23-12-1968	16-8-1972	31-12-1972	इन्सेक्टिसाइड्स एण्ड एलाइड केमिकल्स, नारायणपुरम्, बेलाचेरी हाई रोड, मेडा- वक्कम् डाकघर मद्रास-45	एन्ड्रिन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS : 1310-1958	
76. सी एम/एल-1875 23-12-1968	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	एशियन केबल्स कारपोरेशन लि०, पोन्नरन रोड, थाना महाराष्ट्र	एलुमिनियम चालकों वाले पानीपीन रोधित और पी बी सी खोलवाले केबल इकहरी कोर, दुहरी कोर चटे चटटे और दुहरी कोर गोले 250/440 बी ग्रेड— IS : 1596-1962	
77. सी एम/एल-1892 14-1-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	जयलक्ष्मी फर्टिलाइजर्स, बेकटरायपुरम् तनुक्कु, पश्चिम गोवाधरी, जिला (ग्रान्ध प्रदेश)	डी डी टी घुलन पाउडर— IS : 561-1961	
78. सी एम/एल-1893 14-1-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	„	पैराथियोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS : 2129-1962	
79. सी एम/एल-1910 31-1-1969	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	यू० के० पेन्ट इण्डस्ट्रीज, जी० टी० रोड, अमृतसर	सूखा डिस्टेम्पर— IS : 427-1965	
80. सी एम/एल-1948 31-3-1969	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	भागसन्स पेन्ट इण्डस्ट्रीज (इण्डिया) 16 डी एल एफ इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, नजफगढ़ रोड, नई दिल्ली-15	भीतरी इनेमल— IS : 133-1965	
81. सी एम/एल-1954 16-4-1969	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	„	(क) तैयार मिश्रित रंग-रंगण— IS : 123-1962 और IS : 158- 1965 और IS : 3536-1966 (ख) लकड़ी में भरने का पारदर्शी मसाला— IS : 345-1952	
82. सी एम/एल-1967 6-5-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	जयलक्ष्मी फर्टिलाइजर्स, बेकटरायपुरम् तनुक्कु, पश्चिम गोवाधरी जिला, (ग्रान्ध प्रदेश)	मालाधिरोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS : 2567-1963	
83. सी एम/एल-1969 15-5-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	स्वरूप केमिकल्स, वाटर बक्स रोड, ऐशबाग लखनऊ-4	बी एण सी घुलन पाउडर— IS : 561-1962	
84. सी एम/एल-1970 16-5-1969	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	भागसन्स पेन्ट इण्डस्ट्रीज (इण्डिया) 16 डी एल एफ इण्डस्ट्रियल एरिया, नजफगढ़ रोड, नई दिल्ली-15	(क) बांछित रंग देने के लिए सूखा डिस्टेम्पर— IS : 427-1965 (ख) बांछित रंग देने के लिए तैल हमलसन बाला डिस्टेम्पर— IS : 428-1953	
85. सी एम/एल-1975 22-5-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	कोहिनूर पेन्ट, कलर एण्ड वार्निश वर्क्स, छेहरटा, अमृतसर	(क) बांछित रंग देने के लिए सूखा डिस्टेम्पर— IS : 427-1965 (ख) बांछित रंग देने के लिए तैल हमलसन बाला डिस्टेम्पर— IS : 428-1969	
86. सी एम/एल-2000 30-6-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	कोहिनूर पेन्ट कलर एण्ड वार्निश वर्क्स, छेहरटा, अमृतसर	ब्लैक जापान IS : 341-1952	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
87. सी एम/एल-2001 30-6-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	श्री महेश मेटल वर्क्स, मदनगंज, किशनगंज (राजस्थान)	CuZn37. पदनाम की बेल्लिन पीतल की चदरें IS: 410-1967	
88. सी एम/एल-2043 8-8-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	कीन पेस्टीसाइड्स (प्रा०) लि०, इंड- स्ट्रियल स्टेट, मूडीकल डाकघर बरास्ता पेरम्बुर (केरल)	बी एन सी धूलन पाउडर IS: 561-1962	
89. सी एम/एल-2065 29-8-1969	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	कोल्लूर पेंट फलर एण्ड वार्निश वर्क्स, छेहरटा, अमृतसर	तेयार मिश्रित रंग-रोगन- IS: 103-1962 IS: 104-1962 IS: 106-1962 IS: 123-1962 IS: 1188-1957 IS: 2074-1962	
90. सी एम/एल-2070 9-9-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	वि गुजरात आयरन एण्ड स्टील कं० लि०, अम्बाली रोड, स्टेशन, गांव धलतेज अहमदाबाद	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)- IS: 226-1969	
91. सी एम/एल-2071 9-9-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	वि गुजरात आयरन एण्ड स्टील कं० लि०, अम्बाली रोड, स्टेशन गांव ठालतेज अहमदाबाद	संरचना इस्पात (साधारण) किस्म) IS: 1977-1969	
92. सी एम/एल-2073 12-9-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	संगम इलेक्ट्रिक एण्ड मैकेनिकल इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा० लि०, प्लाट सं० 13/14, इंड- स्ट्रियल इस्टेट, सांगली (महाराष्ट्र)	(क) तीन फेजी प्रेरण मोटर 2.2 कि० वा० (3 हा०पा०) और 3.7 कि०वा० (5 हा०पा०) 'ए' श्रेणी के रोधन वाले— (ख) तीन फेजी प्रेरण मोटर 5.5 कि० वा० (7.5 हा०पा०) 'इ' श्रेणी के रोधन वाले— IS: 25-1961	
93. सी एम/एल-2090 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	दि इंडस्ट्रियल गैसेस लि०, 146-अंशुल रोड, हावड़ा	एक दिश चालित 225 अम्पी और 340 अम्पी मेक अधिकतम लगातार दृस्त वैल्टेज धारा वाले आर्क वैल्टेज ट्रांस- फार्मर— IS: 1851-1966	
94. सी एम/एल-2092 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	वि इंडस्ट्रियल डेवेलपमेंट कारपोरेशन प्रा० उड़ीसा लि०, (हीरा केबल वर्क्स की इकाई) डाकघर हीराकुण्ड, जिला सम्बलपुर, (उड़ीसा)	सभी एलुमीनियम बालक और ए सी एस प्रार० बालक— IS: 398-1961	
95. सी एम/एल-2093 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	कं०प्रार० स्टील यूनिट प्रा० लि०, 16-डी० इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, कल्याणी, जिला नादिया (प० बंगाल)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)— IS: 226-1969	
96. सी० एम/एल-2094 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	"	संरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म)— IS: 1977-1969	
97. सी एम/एल-2100 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	ओ०पी० ओबेराय एण्ड कं० कालेज रोड, पठानकोट	चाय की पेटियों के लिए प्लाईवुड की पट्टियां— IS: 10-1970	
98. सी एम/एल-2104 30-9-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	यूनिट डेवेलपमेंट कं०, मेन रोड, क्विलोन (केरल)	चाय की पेटियों के लिए धातु के फिटिंग— IS: 10-1970	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
99. सी एम/एल-2107 14-10-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	दि ग्रेट इंडियन प्लास्टर मैनु० कं०, इकाई सं० 2, 49 ए, हरिषोण स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-6	चाय की पेटियां के लिए धातु के फिटिंग— IS: 10-1970	
100. सी एम/एल-2110 16-10-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	ग्रहमदाबाद मैनु० एण्ड केलिको प्रिंटिंग कं० लि०, कैलिको कैमिकल्स एण्ड प्लास्टिक्स डिबीजन ग्रनिक, चैम्पूर, बम्बई-74	ट्राइमोनोरोइथाइलीन— IS: 245-1970	
101. सी एम/एल-2116 16-10-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	हिन्दुस्तान, सेमीटरी बेयर एण्ड इंडस्ट्रीज, बहादुरगढ़ (हरीयाणा)	काष्ठाभ सेमीटरी संसाधन (जीनी मिट्टी)— IS: 2556 (भाग 2 से 6)—1969	
102. सी एम/एल-2139 31-10-1969	1-11-1972	30-4-1973	नेशनल पेस्सीसाइड्स, 5-इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, बिदिणा (म०प्र०)	मानाधियोर पायसनी तेज द्रव— IS: 2567-1963	
103. सी एम/एल-2157 28-11-1969	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	कोहेनूर पेंट कलर एण्ड ग्रानिश वर्क्स, छेरटा-अमृतसर	कुसरे डिब्बों में बन्द सामान्य कार्यों के लिए एलुमिनियम रंग-रोगन— IS: 2339-1963	
104. सी एम/एल-2158 28-11-1969	16-9-1972	30-9-1973	जयलक्ष्मी फर्टिलाइजर्स, जी०एन०टी० रोड, माधवगाम, मद्रास-60	बी०एच०सी० धूलन पाउडर— IS: 561-1962	
105. सी एम/एल-2161 4-12-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत एल्बराइजिंग मिल्स (प्रा०) लि०, 1074, निरुवोत्तियूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	मिथाइल पैराथियोनय पायसनीन तेज द्रव— IS: 2865-1964	
106. सी एम/एल-2170 10-12-1969	16-9-1972	30-9-1973	जयलक्ष्मी फर्टिलाइजर्स, जी०एन०टी०, माधवराव मद्रास-60	डी०डी०टी० धूलन पाउडर— IS: 564-1961	
107. सी एम/एल-2172 10-12-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	टाटा फायशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 20-हावड़ा रोड, मल्किया, हावड़ा	बी०एच०सी० पायसनीनय तेज द्रव— IS: 632-1966	
108. सी एम/एल-2173 10-12-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	डी०डी०टी० पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS: 633-1956	
109. सी एम/एल-2228 29-1-1970	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	अनन्त इंडस्ट्रीज (रजि) निक्ट एम-30 इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया जालंधर शहर	(क) बकइयों के धातु के सांचे वाले बेंच रंटे सांकेतिक साइज केवल 45, 50 और 60 मि०मी०— (ख) बकइयों के धातु के सांचे वाले जैक बेंच रंटे, सांकेतिक साइज केवल 50 और 60 मि०मी० और (ग) बकइयों के धातु के सांचे वाले बेंच रंटे, सांकेतिक साइज केवल 60 मि०मी० IS: 4057-1967	
110. सी एम/एल/2230 3-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत एल्बराइजिंग (प्रा०) लि०, 1074, निरुवोत्तियूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	डी०डी०टी० पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS: 633-1956	
111. सी एम/एल-2231 3-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	एल्विन धूलन पाउडर— IS: 1308-1959	
112. सी एम/एल-2236 9-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	बी०एच०सी० पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS: 632-1966	
113. सी एम/एल-2237 9-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	एल्विन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS: 1307-1958	
114. सी एम/एल-2266 27-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	जयलक्ष्मी फर्टिलाइजर्स, जी०एन०टी० रोड, माधवगाम, मद्रास-60	बी०एच०सी० जल विमर्जनीय तेज चूर्ण— IS: 562-1962	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
115. सी एम/एल-2267 27-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	जय लक्ष्मी फटिलाईजर्स जी एन जी रोड, एलिफन्टा पायसनीय तेज द्रव— मद्रास-60	IS: 1310-1958	
116. सी एम/एल-2268 27-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्बराईजिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, एन्डोमल्केन पायसनीय तेज द्रव 1074, निरुवोतिपूर हाई रोड, IS 4323-1967 मद्रास-19		
117. सी एम/एल-2282 18-3-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	„	मालाधियोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS: 2567-1963	
118. सी एम/एल-2289 24-3-1970	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	पेरामाउंड मीटर प्रा० लि०, पंजित नेहरू मार्ग, जामनगर (गुजरात)	अनुमानित प्रकार के घरेलू पानी के मीटर शुष्क डायल वाले टाइप 'ए' 15 मि०मी० और 25 मि०मी० साइज— IS: 779-1968	
119. सी एम/एल-2294 31-3-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	ए० पाल इस्ट्रूमेंट कम्पनी, जी० (हरयाणा)	सामान्य कार्यों के लिए कांच के ताप-मापी— IS: 2480-1964	
120. सी एम/एल-2312 27-4-1970	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	यू०के० पेंट इंडस्ट्रीज, जी०टी० रोड, अमृतसर	धातु के फ्रेमों में भरने की पट्टी— IS: 419-1968	
121. सी एम/एल-2323 15-5-1970	1-9-1972	28-2-1973	कमर्शियल टिम्बर इंडस्ट्रीज, खजूरी रोड, यमुनानगर, जिला अम्बाला (हरयाणा)	चाय की पेटियों के लिए प्लास्टर की पट्टियाँ— IS: 10-1970	
122. सी एम/एल-2325 19-5-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	जयलक्ष्मी फटिलाईजर्स, जी० एन०टी० रोड, माधवराम, मद्रास-60	मालाधियोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— IS: 2567-1963	
123. सी एम/एल-2356 1-7-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	के०आर० स्टील यूनिट प्रा० लि०, 16-डी, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, कल्याणी, जिला नाविया, (प० बंगाल)	ठंडी मरोड़ी सादी इस्पात की सरिया— IS: 1786-1966	
124. सी एम/एल-2399 31-8-1970	1-9-1972	31-8-1973	गैसन डंकरले एण्ड कं० लि०, प्रोल्ड बी०पी०टी० रोड, मादुल, बम्बई-74 ए०एम०	द्रवित गैसों के भंडारण और परिवहन के लिए बेल्टकृत प्रत्य कार्बन के 33.3 लीटर समाई वाले इस्पात के गैस मिलेण्डर— IS: 3196-1968	
125. सी एम/एल-2405 11-9-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्बराईजिंग मिल्स (प्रा०) लि०, 1074, आर्द्रन योग्य गंधक चूर्ण— निरुवोतिपूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	IS: 3383-1965	
126. सी एम/एल-2406 11-9-1970	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	जयलक्ष्मी एग्रो कैमिकल्स, अमरावती रोड, गोरतल्ला गोब की हद, डाकघर गुदूर-2, जिला गुदूर (आन्ध्र प्रदेश)	बी०एच०सी० धूलन पाउडर— IS: 561-1972	
127. सी एम/एल-2409 28-9-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	कांतिनेटल इंडस्ट्रीज, लालबहादुर शास्त्री स्टेडियम के सामने, बापूनगर, अहमदाबाद-23	धातु के हीलड फ्रेम (क) बगल में लकड़ी की टेक लगे. (ख) बगल में इस्पात की टेक लगे. IS: 4465-1970	
128. सी एम/एल-2411 28-9-1970	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	ए०आर० नाम चौधरी एण्ड कं०, बरूईपुर, डाकघर बरूईपुर जिला— 24 परगना (प० बंगाल)	ओर क्लोजर (द्रव नियंत्रित) IS: 3564-1970	
129. सी एम/एल-2412 28-9-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	सनरे कैमिकल इंडस्ट्रीज, मोतीलाल नेहरू रोड, आगरा	बी०एच०सी० जल विमर्जनीय तेज चूर्ण— IS: 562-1962	
130. सी एम/एल-2413 28-9-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	रामकृष्ण कुलवन्तराय स्टील्स प्रा० लि०, 403/ए-निरुवोतिपूर हाई रोड, (अरजैक्स बस टर्मिनस से आगे) निरुवोतिपूर-मद्रास-19	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)— IS: 226-1969	



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
131. सी एम/एन-2414 28-9-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	रामकृष्ण कुलवंतराय स्टील्स प्रा० लि० 403/ए निरुबोत्तियूर हाई रोड (भरजैकस बस टर्मिनस से आगे) निरुबोत्तियूर मद्रास 19	मंरचना हस्यात (साधारण किसम)--- IS : 1977-1969	
132. सी एम/एन-2417 29-9-1970	1-10-1970	30-9-1973	डालीमा बिस्कुट प्रा० लि०, राजपुरा जिना पटियाला (पंजाब)	बिस्कुट--- IS : 1011-1968	
133. सी एम/एन-2418 30-9-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	मल्टीप्लेक्स ऐग्रो इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, प्लाट सं० 184/11 और 184/12 नरोदा इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, नरोदा-अहमदाबाद-2	बी०एच०सी० धूलन पाउडर--- IS : 561-1962	
134. सी एम/एन-2421 6-10-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	"	एलिट्रन पायसनीय तेज द्रव--- IS : 1310-1958	
135. सी एम/एन-2425 14-10-1970	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	नारंग ब्रुथरीज, नवाब गंज, जिना गोंडा, (उ०प्र०)	बियर--- IS : 3865-1966	
136. सी एम/एन-2428 18-10-1970	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	हिन्दुस्तान जर्नल इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, नांगलोई, बिल्ली	द्रवित गैसों के संभरण और परिवहन के लिए वेल्डकृत अल्युमिनियम हस्यात के 33.8 नीटर गमाई वाले गैस सिलिण्डर--- IS : 3198-1968	
137. सी एम/एन-2429 19-10-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्बराइजिंग मिल्स (प्रा) लि०, 1074, निरुबोत्तियूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	फैनीट्रायियोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव--- IS : 5281-1969	
138. सी एम/एन-2430 20-10-1970	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	रॉकवेल्ड इलेक्ट्रोड इंडिया लि०, 29-इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, अम्बानूर-मद्रास-58	मंरचना हस्यात की मेटल आर्क बोलिडिंग के लिए ठोके इलेक्ट्रोड--- IS : 814-1970	
139. सी एम/एन-2433 21-10-1970	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	ए०जी०इ० डब्ल्यू० स्टील मैनु० (प्रा०) लि०, अभिनिका आयमन मिल कंपाउण्ड, गोमतीपुर गेट के बाहर अहमदाबाद-21	हस्यात की बिडकियां और रोशनदान--- IS : 1038-1968	
140. सी एम/एन-2442 30-10-1970	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	वेन्सम ऐग्रो कैमिकल्स एण्ड एलाइड इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा० लि०, प्राइवेट इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, कोयम्बटूर	बी एच०सी० धूलन पाउडर--- IS : 561-1962	
141. सी एम/एन-2443 30-10-1970	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	भोरका उद्योग, बड़ा मन्दिर, पानीहटी-24 परगना	हस्यात के ड्रम--- IS : 2552-1970	
142. सी एम/एन-2471 30-11-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	हरियाणा कैमिकल्स एण्ड पेस्टीसाइड्स, टी/16, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, बहादुरगढ़, जिना रोहतक (हरियाणा)	बी०एच०सी० धूलन पाउडर--- IS : 561-1962	
143. सी एम/एन-2512 20-1-1971	1-10-1972	31-2-1973	मल्टीवेल्ड वायर क० (प्रा०) लि०, 59-मरोल महर्षि रोड, मरोल, बम्बई-59	सामान्य उपयोग के लिए हस्यात की वेल्डकृत बुनी महीन जाली--- IS : 4948-1968	
144. सी एम/एन-2550 19-2-1971	1-9-1972	31-8-1973	जतिन्दर टिम्बर इंडस्ट्रीज, 503-मॉडल टाउन, यमुना नगर, जिना अम्बाला, (हरियाणा)	चाय की पेटियां के लिए प्लाइवुड की पट्टियां IS : 10-1970	
145. सी एम/एन-2594 16-3-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	भारत पुल्बराइजिंग मिल्स प्रा० लि०, 1074-निरुबोत्तियूर हाई रोड, मद्रास-19	डाइएलिट्रन पायसनीय तेज द्रव--- IS : 1054-1962	
146. सी एम/एन-2595 16-3-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	"	क्लोरेडेन पायसनीय तेज द्रव--- IS : 2682-1966	
147. सी एम/एन-2611 29-3-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	ई आई डी पैरी लि०, ग्रेड सं० 38/3, कठिउक्कम गांव, एन्नोर-सैवपेट तालुक, मद्रास-57	मुगियों का चुंगा--- IS : 1374-1968	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
148. सी एम/एल-2612 29-3-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	ई आई डी पैरी लि० शै० सं० 38/3 कटिउकम पणुओं के लिए मिश्रित आहार— गांव, एन्तोर सैदपेट तालुक मद्रास 57	IS : 2052-1968	
149. सी एम/एल-2616 29-3-1971	1-10-1972	31-10-1973	नार्देन इंडिया प्लास्टिड, 1213, मथुरा रोड, फरीदाबाद, (हरियाणा)	टोम मध्यम भाग वाले लकड़ी के समतल कपाट (ब्लाक बोर्ड की कोर वाले)—— IS: 2202 (भाग 1)-1966	
150. सी एम/एल-2626 29-3-1971	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	यूनाइटेड वायर रोपर्स लि०, मारुतिकुमार रोड, पंचपखाड़ी, थाना (महाराष्ट्र)	सामान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिए इस्पात के तार के रस्से—— IS : 2266-1970	
151. सी एम/एल-2642 30-3-1971	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	यूनिवर्सल केबल मैनु० कं०, रेलवे स्टेशन के सामने, फरीदाबाद ।	(क) इकहरी कोर पोलीइथाइलीन रोधित और पोलीइथालीन खोल वाले, 650/1100 वोल्ट एलुमिनियम जालकों वाले ऋतुमह केबल; (ख) इकहरी कोर पोलीइथाइलीन रोधित टेप सहित व टेप रहित, ब्रेडेड और सहमिलित 250/440 वो० एलुमिनियम जालकों वाले ऋतुमह केबल—— (ग) षपटे दुहरी कोर पोलीइथाइलीन रोधित पोलीइथाइलीन खोल वाले 250/440 वोल्ट ऋतुमह एलुमिनियम जालक, और (घ) पोलीइथाइलीन रोधित टेपसहित अथवा टेपरहित ब्रेडेड और सहमिलित ऋतुमह षपटे दुहरी कोर, 650/1100 वोल्ट वाले एलुमिनियम जालक, IS : 3035 (भाग 2)-1965 और IS : 3035(भाग 3)-1967	
152. सी एम/एल-2740 18-8-1971	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	इन्दौर आयरन एण्ड स्टील मिल्स, 314-भगीरथपुरा, इन्दौर शहर (म० प्र०)	कंक्रीट प्रबलन के लिये ठंडी मरोड़ी विकृत इस्पात की सर्निया—— IS : 1786-1966	
153. सी एम/एल-2741 18-8-1971	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	ऋतुमान इंजीनियरी वर्क्स, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया, ऐशबाग, लखनऊ ।	कंक्रीट प्रबलन के लिए ठंडी मरोड़ी विकृत इस्पात की सर्निया—— (क) 14 मिमी व्यास तक की (ग्रुप 1) के अन्तर्गत, (ख) 14 मिमी से ऊपर व्यास की ग्रुप 2 के अन्तर्गत —— IS : 1786-1968	
154. सी एम/एल-2744 25-8-1971	1-9-1972	1-9-1973	टोडियालूर कोआपरेटिव ऐग्रीकल्चरल, सर्विस लि०, टोडियालूर टाकशर, कोयम्बटूर-11	डी एच सी जलविमर्जनीय पाउडर—— IS : 562-1962	
155. सी एम/एल-2745 25-8-1971	1-9-1972	15-3-1973	„	डी डी टी जल विमर्जनीय पाउडर—— IS : 565-1961	
156. सी एम/एल-2750 26-8-1971	1-9-1972	15-3-1973	वि सैमूर आयरन एण्ड स्टील लि०, भद्रावती (सैमूर राज्य)	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म) के रूप में रिरोलिंग के लिए कार्बन इस्पात के बिलेट—— IS: 2830-1964	
157. सी एम/एल-2751 26-8-1971	1-9-1972	15-3-1973	वि सैमूर आयरन एण्ड स्टील लि०, भद्रावती (सैमूर राज्य)	संरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म) के रूप में रिरोलिंग के लिए कार्बन इस्पात के बिलेट——	

1	2	3	4	5	6
158. सी एम/एल-2758 7-9-1971	16-9-1972	30-9-1973	मल्टीप्लेक्स एग्रो इंडस्ट्रीज (प्रा०) लि०, एलिङ्गन घूमन पाउडर— प्लाट सं० 184/111 और 12 नरोदा, IS : 1308-1958 इंडस्ट्रीयल इस्टेट, नरोदा, अहमदाबाद-2		
159. सी एम/एल-2760 13-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	एलाइड इंडस्ट्रियल ट्रेडर्स, 55 बी, बजीर हमन रोड, लखनऊ-1	इकहरी नली वाले पायदान लगे पम्प— IS : 1971-1965	
160. सी एम/एल-2762 13-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	जौली स्टील इंडस्ट्रीज प्रा० लि०, 32- नगर रोड, पूना-14	संरचना इस्पात (मानक किस्म)--- IS : 226-1969	
161. सी एम/एल-2763 13-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	„	संरचना इस्पात (साधारण किस्म)--- IS : 1977-1969	
162. सी एम/एल-2767 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	पिस्मनेर बुअरीज इंडिया लि०, अर्सेम यूनिट, अर्सेम मार गाँव, बेरिम रोड, मारगांव, गोआ 1	बियर--- IS : 3865-1966	
163. सी एम/एल-2768 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	बंगलौर पेस्टीसाइड्स लि०, 10 वां मील पस्थर टम्कूर रोड, बंगलौर-22	बी एच सी जल विसर्जनीय तेज चूर्ण--- IS : 562-1962	
164. सी एम/एल-2769 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	„	डी डी टी जल विसर्जनीय तेज चूर्ण--- IS : 565-1961	
165. सी एम/एल-2770 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	„	सी एच सी जल विसर्जनीय पाउडर--- IS : 1507-1966	
166. सी एम/एल-2771 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-10-1973	इंडस्ट्रियल मिनरल्स एण्ड केमिकल्स, कं० प्रा० लि०, कुरला-मारोल रोड, अंधेरी, बम्बई-58	थायोमिटॉन पायसनीय तेज द्रव--- IS : 3905-1966	
167. सी एम/एल-2772 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-10-1973	इंडस्ट्रियल मिनरल्स एण्ड केमिकल्स, कं० प्रा० लि०, कुरला-मारोल रोड, चकला- बम्बई-69	डाइक्लोरबोरा पायसनीय तेज द्रव--- IS : 5277-1969	
168. सी एम/एल-2773 16-9-1973	16-8-1973	15-9-1973	दि अग्रूस कं० लि०, डाकघर अग्रूस, हुगली	(क) दुहरी ताने वाले पटसन बोरे--- IS : 3966-1967 (ख) दुहरी ताने वाले घाटे के बोरे--- IS : 3984-1967	
169. सी एम/एल-2776 27-9-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	अहमदाबाद स्टीलक्राफ्ट्स एण्ड रोलिंग मिल्स, निकट रेलवे स्टेशन, अहमदाबाद- 21	खिड़कियों और रोशनदानों के लिए बेल्लित इस्पात के सैक्शन एफ०'7' की IS : 1038-1968	
170. सी एम/एल-2778 6-10-1971	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	प्रकाश सा मिल्स मेन रोड, कालेटुमकर डाकघर निकट इरिजालकडू रेलवे स्टेशन जिला त्रिचूर (केरल)	चाय की पेटियों की पट्टियाँ--- IS : 10-1970	
171. सी एम/एल-2779 8-10-1971	16-10-1971	15-10-1973	लेखपाणी बेनियर एण्ड साँ मिल्स, डाकघर लेखपाणी बगस्ता लीडो (असम)	चाय की पेटियों के लिए प्लाश्बुड के तहत IS : 10-1970	
172. सी एम/एल-2784 21-10-1971	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	एन०टी० बेटान चेट्टियार एण्ड कं०, पोस्ट बाक्स सं० 14, 21 माउंट रोड, कुन्नूर-2 (नीलगिरी)	चाय की पेटियों के लिए धातु के फिटिंग IS : 10-1970	

## MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, SCIENCE &amp; TECHNOLOGY

Indian Standards Institution  
New Delhi, the 11th April, 1974

S.O.—1955—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that one hundred and seventy two licences particulars of which are given in the following Schedule, have been renewed during the month of October, 1972 :—

## SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Period of Validity From	To	Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/Process covered by the License and the Relevant IS : Designation
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	CM/L-15 13-9-1956	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bombay Suburban Village Industries Association, Flag Section Gram-odyog Wadi, 38/42, Dockyard Road, Bombay 10 DD.	The National Flag of India (Cotton khadi) IS : 1-1968
2.	CM/L-20 24-10-1956	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Shree Digvijay Cement Co. Ltd., Sikka, Via Jamnagar (Gujarat)	Ordinary portland cement— IS : 269-1967.
3.	CM/L-104 7-10-1958	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	EID Parry Ltd., Nellikuppam South Arcot Distt. (Tamil Nadu)	Rectified spirit Grade 1— IS : 323-1959
4.	CM/L-141 24-9-1959	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Tata Fison Industries Ltd., 20, Howrah Road, Salkia, Calcutta.	DDT dusting powders— IS : 564-1961.
5.	CM/L-142 24-9-1959	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Tata Fison Industries 20, Howrah Road, Salkia, Calcutta.	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962.
6.	CM/L-168 22-2-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	—do—	BHC water dispersible powder— IS : 562-1962.
7.	CM/L-200 15-6-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulversing Mills Pvt. Ltd., 589, Thiruvottury High Road, Madras-19.	DDT dusting powder— IS : 564-1961
8.	CM/L-201 15-6-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	—do—	DDT water dispersible powder— IS : 565-1961.
9.	CM/L-202 15-6-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	—do—	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962
10.	CM/L-204 28-6-1960	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Jaipur Metals & Electricals Ltd, Near Railway Station, Jaipur-6.	Copper rods for boiler stay— IS : 288-1960
11.	CM/L-217 21-8-1960	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Tata Fison Industries 20, Howrah Road, Salkia, Calcutta.	DDT water dispersible powder concentrates— IS : 565-1961
12.	CM/L-302 25-5-1961	1-9-1972	31-8-1973	National Plywood Industries, 6 Gorapada Sarkar Lane, Calcutta-4	Tea-chest plywood panels— IS : 10-1970
13.	CM/L-338 1-9-1961	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Indo-Asia Traders Pvt Ltd., Nakodar Road, Jullundur City.	Metal clad switches, 15 Amp— IS : 4064-1967
14.	CM/L-343 27-9-1961	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	S.G. Can Factory, Yamuna nagar, Rly. Station Jagadhri, Distt. Ambala.	18-litre square tins— IS : 916-1966
15.	CM/L-348 11-10-1961	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	The Malwa Vanaspathi & Chemical Co., Ltd., Bhagirathpura, Indore.	18-litre square tins— IS : 916-1966
16.	CM/L-365 12-12-1961	1-1-1972	31-12-1972	Ditz Electricals (India) Ltd., 29, Malkaganj Road, Delhi.	Electric portable immersion heaters for domestic use (500 watts to 4000 watts capacity)— IS : 368-1963
17.	CM/L-367 15-12-1961	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulversing Mills Pvt. Ltd., 589, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 1310-1958
18.	CM/L-451 13-8-1962	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	Coimbatore Premier Corpn. Pvt. Ltd. Patel Road, Coimbatore-9	Three-phase induction motors up to 7.5 kW (10 hp) only with class 'A' insulation— IS : 325-1961
19.	CM/L-501 23-1-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Tata Fison Industries, 20, Howrah Road, Salkia, Calcutta.	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 1310-1958
20.	CM/L-539 13-5-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	—do—	COC water dispersible powder concentrates— IS : 1507-1959
21.	CM/L-577 11-9-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulversing Mills Pvt. Ltd., 1074, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	Parathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2129-1962

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
22.	CM/L-580 11-9-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Kohinoor Paint Colour & Varnish Works, Chcharta, Amritsar.	(a) Synthetic enamel, exterior, Type 1— IS : 2932-1964; (b) Enamel, exterior, Type 2— IS : 2933-1964 and (c) Enamel, interior— IS : 133-1965
23.	CM/L-613 31-12-1963	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	The National Rolling & Steel Ropes Ltd., Shamnagar, 24 Parganas (West Bengal)	(a) Steel wire ropes for haulage purposes in mines— IS : 1856-1970 and (b) Steel wire ropes for winding purposes in mines— IS : 1855-1961
24.	CM/L-616 7-1-1964	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Jaipur Metals & Electricals Ltd., Near Railway Station, Jaipur-6.	Hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes— IS : 398-1961
25.	CM/L-683 17-6-1964	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	Indore Steel & Iron Mills, 314, Bhagirathpura, Indore City (M.P.)	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1969
26.	CM/L-684 17-6-1964	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	—do—	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1969
27.	CM/L-701 26-6-1964	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Godrej Soaps Pvt. Ltd., Vikhroli, Bombay-79.	Stearic acid, technical— IS : 1675-1960 and Oleic acid, technical— IS : 1676-1960
28.	CM/L-720 29-6-1964	1-8-1972	31-7-1973	Modern Industries, Sahibabad, Ghaziabad (U.P.)	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1969
29.	CM/L-721 29-6-1964	1-8-1972	31-7-1973	Do.	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1969
30.	CM/L-724 29-6-1964	1-8-1972	31-7-1973	Kisan Engineering Works P. Ltd, Dankur Station, N. Rly., Distt. Bulandshahr (U.P.)	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1969
31.	CM/L-725 29-6-1964	1-8-1972	31-7-1973	Do.	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1969
32.	CM/L-776 28-9-1964	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	Bhagsons Paint Industries (India). 16 DLF, Industrial Area, Najafgarh Rd., New Delhi-15.	Putty for use on metal frames— IS : 419-1967
33.	CM/L-782 17-9-1964	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Hindustan Wires Ltd., B.T. Road, P.O. Suckchar, Distt. 24 Parganas (West Bengal)	Plain hard-drawn steel wire for prestressed concrete— IS : 1785 (Part I)—1966
34.	CM/L-792 30-9-1964	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Do.	Steel wire for the core of steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes— IS : 398-1961
35.	CM/L-793 30-9-1964	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	National Steel Works Ltd., Warden House (First Floor), Sir Ferozeshah Mehta Road, Fort Bombay.	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1969
36.	CM/L-794 30-9-1964	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	National Steel Works Ltd., Warden House (First Floor), Sir Ferozeshah Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1969
37.	CM/L-1050 31-3-1965	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	Kashmira Ceramic Products Pvt. Ltd S.V. Road, Village Mira, Borivli, Bombay-92 (NB)	Salt-glazed stoneware pipes and fittings of diameter 100mm, 150mm, 200mm, and 300mm— IS : 651-1971
38.	CM/L-1122 6-8-1965	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	Cyanamid India Ltd., Atul Post Office Via Bulsar	Malathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2567-1963
39.	CM/L-1144 14-9-1965	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Auto Pin (India) Regd., Plot No. 16, Industrial Area, Faridabad (Haryana).	Spring leaves and leaf springs— IS : 1135-1966
40.	CM/L-1150 4-10-1965	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Asian Cables Corpn. Ltd., Pokhran Road, Thana (Maharashtra).	PVC insulated (Heavy duty) electric cables for working voltages up to and including 1100 volts with copper and aluminium conductors— IS : 1554 (Part I) 1964
41.	CM/L-1218 2-3-1966	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	United Wire Ropes Ltd, Maruti Kumar Road, Panchpakhadi, Thana, (Maharashtra).	(a) Steel wire ropes for haulage purposes in mines— IS : 1856-1970 and (b) Steel wire ropes for winding purposes in mines— IS:1855-1961

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
42.	CM/L-1227 11-3-1966	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Nahan Foundry Ltd., Nahan (H.P.)	Three-phase induction motors (up to 15 hp only)— IS : 325-1961
43.	CM/L-1284 27-6-1966	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	The National Rolling & Steel Ropes Ltd., Shamnagar, 24 Parganas (West Bengal)	Steel wire ropes for general engineering purposes— IS : 2266-1970
44.	CM/L-1298 20-7-1966	16-7-1972	15-7-1973	Modi Stools, Modi Nagar (U.P.)	Mild steel wire for general engineering purposes— IS : 280-1972
45.	CM/L-1317 29-8-1966	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Hindustan Wires Ltd., B.T. Road, P.O. Sukchar, Distt. 24 Parganas	Galvanized round steel armour wire— IS : 434 (Part II)— 1964, and IS : 3975-1967
46.	CM/L-1322 30-8-1966	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Multiweld Wire Co. (P) Ltd., Marol Maroshi Road, Marol, Bombay-59	Hard-drawn steel wire fabric for concrete reinforcement— IS : 1566-1967
47.	CM/L-1328 6-9-1966	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	S.R.P. Tools Ltd., Lattice Bridge, Tiruvanmiyur, Madras-41.	Milling cutters of the following types :— (a) End mill (taper and parallel shank) of one piece construction, (b) Slot milling cutter of one piece construction; and (c) Parallel shank end mills, two piece construction type N— IS : 1830-1971
48.	CM/L-1329 6-9-1966	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Do.	(a) Parallel hand reamers with parallel shanks of one piece construction— IS : 5444-1969 and (b) Chucking reamers with taper shanks of one piece and two piece construction— IS : 5447-1969
49.	CM/L-1340 30-9-1966	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Hyderabad Allwyn Metal Works Ltd, Sanatnagar, Hyderabad-18.	Welded low carbon steel gas cylinders for the storage and transportation of liquified petroleum gases— IS : 3196-1968
50.	CM/L-1403 3-3-1967	16-3-1972	15-3-1973	Indian Mineral Industries Ltd., Trenching Ground Approach Road, Agarpara, 24 Parganas.	BHC— water dispersible powders— IS : 562-1962
51.	CM/L-1439 15-5-1967	16-10-1972	15-5-1973	Singhal Pesticides, 9/122, Moti Bagh, Jamuna Bridge Agra.	Aldrin dusting powders— IS : 1308-1958
52.	CM/L-1510 8-9-1967	16-4-1972	15-3-1973	Associated Wires & Conductors Co. Pvt. Ltd., Tanda Road, Jullundur City (Pb).	Hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes— IS : 398-1961
53.	CM/L-1517 15-9-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Jayalakshmi Fertilizers, Venkatarayapuram, Tanuku,, West Godavari Distt. (Andhra Pradesh)	BHC dusting powder— IS : 561-1962
54.	CM/L-1518 15-9-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	—do—	DDT water dispersible powder— IS : 565-1961
55.	CM/L-1519 15-9-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	—do—	BHC water dispersible powder— IS : 562-1962
56.	CM/L-1520 15-9-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Jaylakshmi Fertilisers, Venkatarayapuram, Tanuku, West Godavari Distt. (Andhra Pradesh)	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 1310-1958
57.	CM/L-1525 1-9-1967	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulversing Mills (Pvt.) Ltd., 1074, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	Copper oxychloride dispersible powders concentrates. IS : 1507-1966
58.	CM/L-1530 26-9-1967	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Warren Metal Industries Ltd., 'H' Block, Hide Road, Kidderpore, Calcutta-43.	Tea-chest metal fittings— IS : 10-1970.
59.	CM/L-1531 26-9-1967	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Khaitan Sons & Co. (Tea-chest) Ltd., 34 B.T. Road, Cossipore, Calcutta-2.	Tea-chest metal fittings— IS : 10-1970
60.	CM/L-1545 9-10-1967	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Eltex Engineering Corpn., Pvt. Ltd., Krishnarayapuram Road, Ganapathy Post, Coimbatore-6	Three-phase induction motors, 2.2 kW (3 hp), 3.7 kW (5 hp), 5.5 kW (7.5 hp) and 7.5 kW (10 hp) with class 'A' insulation— IS : 325-1961

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
61. CM/L-1566 24-11-1967	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Keen Pesticides (Pvt) Ltd., Industrial Estate, Mudical P.O., (Via) Perumbavoor (Kerala).	BHC water dispersible powders— IS : 562-1962	
62. CM/L-1666 1-4-1968	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	United Pulversiers, Bodla, Agra-7.	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962	
63. CM/L-1730 28-6-1968	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	Bombay Wire Ropes Ltd., Kolshet Road, Thana (Maharashtra).	(a) Steel wire ropes for winding purposes in mines— IS : 1855-1961 and (b) Steel wire ropes for haulage purposes in mines— IS : 1856-1970	
64. CM/L-1778 30-8-1968	1-11-1972	30-4-1973	Raj Brush Industries, 135, Malviya Nagar, Bhopal-3.	Flat brushes for paints & varnishes (12 mm to 50 mm only—) IS : 384-1964	
65. CM/L-1781 30-8-1968	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Chettinad Cement Corporation Ltd., Puliyar Cement Factory Post, Karur Taluk, Trichy Distt. (Tamil Nadu).	Ordinary portland cement— IS : 269-1967	
66. CM/L-1789 16-9-1968	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Burmah Shell Oil Storage & Distributing Co. of India Ltd., Burmah Shell House, Ballard Estate, Bombay-1.	Hexane, food grade— IS : 3470-1966	
67. CM/L-1792 16-9-1968	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	The Khodiyar Pottery Works Ltd., Opposite Railway Station, Sihor (Gujarat).	Vitreous sanitary appliances (vitreous China)— IS : 2556 (Pt. II to VI & X)-1967	
68. CM/L-1799 25-9-1968	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	The Agro Industrial & Chemicals Co., 13-A, Kalyani View, Rudrapur, Distt. Nainital (UP).	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates — IS : 1310-1958	
69. CM/L-1801 27-9-1968	1-9-1972	31-8-1973	Agrawal Metal Works P. Ltd., Agrawal Road, Rewari (Haryana)	Rolled brass sheets, strips other than those meant for utensils, above 0.5mm thickness, designation CuZn 37— IS : 410-1967	
70. CM/L-1802 4-10-1968	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	Bombay Wire Ropes Ltd., Kolshat Road, Thana (Maharashtra).	Steel wire ropes for general engineering purposes— IS : 2266-1970	
71. CM/L-1814 15-10-1968	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	L. Madanlal (Aluminium) Pvt. Ltd., 2 Haren Mukherjee Road, Belur, Howrah.	Aluminium utensils, grade SIC— IS : 21-1959	
72. CM/L-1817 15-10-1968	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	Bombay Wire Ropes Ltd., Kolshat Road, Thana (Maharashtra).	Steel wire for the core of steel-cored aluminium conductors— IS : 398-1961	
73. CM/L-1824 31-10-1968	1-11-1972	30-4-1973	Him Pine Industries, Harrawala, Distt. Dehradun (UP).	Plywood tea-chest battens— IS : 10-1970	
74. CM/L-1839 22-11-1968	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	The Agro Industrial Chemicals Co., 13-A, Kalyani View, Rudrapur, Distt. Nainital (UP).	Aldrin emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 1307-1958	
75. CM/L-1865 23-12-1968	16-8-1972	31-12-1972	Insecticides & Allied Chemicals, "Narayanapuram", Velacherry High Rd., Medavakkom P.O., Madras-45.	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 1310-1958	
76. CM/L-1875 23-12-1968	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Asian Cabels Corp., Ltd., Pokhran Road, Thana (Maharashtra).	Polythene insulated and PVC sheathed cables, single core, twin core, flat and twin core circular, 250/440 volts grade with aluminium conductors— IS : 1596-1962	
77. CM/L-1892 14-1-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Jayalakshmi Fertilisers, Venkatarayapuram, Tanuku, West Godavari Distt. (Andhra Pradesh).	DDT dusting powders. IS : 564-1961	
78. CM/L-1893 14-1-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	—do—	Parathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2129-1962	
79. CM/L-1910 31-1-1969	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	U.K. Paints Industries, G.T. Road, Amritsar.	Dry distemper— IS : 427-1965	
80. CM/L-1948 31-3-1969	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	Bhagsons Paint Industries (India), 16 DLF, Industrial Area, Najafgarh Rd. New Delhi-15.	Enamel, interior— IS : 133-1965	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
81.	CM/L-1954 16-4-1969	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	Bhagsons Paint Industries (India), 16 DLF, Industrial Area, Najafgarh Rd, N. Delhi-15	(a) Ready mixed paints— IS : 123-1962, IS : 158-1965 and IS : 3536-1966 and (b) Wood filler, transparent— IS : 345-1952
82.	CM/L-1967 6-5-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Jayalakshmi Fertilisers, Venkatara-yapuram, Tanuku, West Goda-vari Distt. (Andhra Pradesh).	Malathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2567-1963.
83.	CM/L-1969 15-5-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Swarup Chemicals, Water Works Road, Aishbagh, Lucknow-4.	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962
84.	CM/L-1970 16-5-1969	16-10-1972	15-4-1973	Bhagsons Paint Industries (India), 16 DLF, Industrial Area, Najafgarh Rd, New Delhi-15.	(a) Distemper, dry, colour as required— IS : 427-1965 and (b) Distemper, oil emulsion, colour as required— IS : 428-1953
85.	CM/L-1975 22-5-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Kohinoor Paint Colour & Varnish Works, Chhearta, Amritsar.	(a) Distemper, dry, colour as required— IS : 427-1965 and (b) Distemper, oil emulsion, colour as required— IS : 428-1969
86.	CM/L-2000 30-6-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	—do—	Black japan— IS : 341-1952
87.	CM/L-2001 30-6-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Shree Mahesh Metal Works, Madan Ganj, Kishangarh (Rajasthan).	Rolled brass sheets of CuZn 37 designation— IS : 410-1967
88.	CM/L-2043 8-8-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Keen Pesticides (Pvt) Ltd., Industrial Estate, Mudical P.O., (Via) Perumbavoor (Kerala).	BHC DP— IS : 561-1962
89.	CM/L-2065 29-8-1969	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	Kohinoor Paint Colour & Varnish Works, Chhearta, Amritsar.	Ready mixed paints— IS : 103-1962, IS : 104-1962, IS : 106-1962 IS : 123-1962, IS : 1188-1957 and IS : 2074-1962.
90.	CM/L-2070 9-9-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	The Gujarat Iron & Steel Co. Ltd., Amboli Road, Station, Village Thaltej, Ahmedabad.	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1969
91.	CM/L-2071 9-9-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	—do—	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1969
92.	CM/L-2073 12-9-1969	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Sangam Elec. and Mech. Industries Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 13/14, Industrial Estate, Sangli (Maharashtra).	(a) Three-phase induction motors 2.2 kW (3 hp) and 3.7 kW (5 hp) with Class 'A' insulation and (b) Three-phase induction motors, 5.5 kW (7.5 hp) with Class 'E' insulation— IS : 325-1961
93.	CM/L-2090 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	The Industrial Gases Ltd., 146 Andul Road, Howrah-3.	Arc-welding transformers, single operator type, rating 225 Amps and 340 Amps continuous hand welding current IS : 1851-1966
94.	CM/L-2092 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	The Industrial Development Corpn of Orissa Ltd., (Unit : Hira Cable Works) P.O. Hirakud, Distt. Sambalpur (Orissa).	All aluminium conductors and ACSR conductors— IS : 398-1961
95.	CM/L-2093 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	K.R. Steel Union P. Ltd., 16-D, Industrial Area, Kalyani, Distt. Nadia (W. Bengal).	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1969
96.	CM/L-2094 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	—do—	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1969
97.	CM/L-2100 30-9-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	O.P. Oberoi & Co., College Road, Pathankot.	Plywood tea-chest battens— IS : 10-1970
98.	CM/L-2104 30-9-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Union Engineering Co., Main Road, Quilon, (Kerala).	Tea-chest metal fittings— IS : 10-1970
99.	CM/L-2107 14-10-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	The Great Indian Plywood Mfg Co., Unit No. 2, 49A, Hari Ghosh Street, Calcutta-6.	Tea-chest metal fittings— IS : 10-1970
100.	CM/L-2110 16-10-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Ahmedabad Manufacturing & Calico Printing Co. Ltd., Calico Chemicals and Plastics Div., Anik Chembur, Bombay-74.	Trichloroethylene— IS : 245-1970



(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
101. CM/L-2116 16-10-1969	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Hindustan Sanitaryware & Industries, Bahadurgarh (Haryana)	Vitreous sanitary appliances (vitreous China)— IS : 2556 (Parts II to VI)-1969	
102. CM/L-2139 31-10-1969	1-11-1972	30-4-1973	National Pesticides, 5 Industrial Estate, Vidisha (MP)	Malathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2567-1963	
103. CM/L-2157 28-11-1969	1-10-1972	31-3-1973	Kohinoor Paint Colour & Varnish Works, Chheharta, Amritsar	Aluminium paint for general purposes in dual containers— IS : 2339-1963	
104. CM/L-2158 28-11-1969	16-9-1972	30-9-1973	Jayalakshmi Fertilizers, G.N.T. Road, Madhavaram, Madras-60	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962	
105. CM/L-2161 4-12-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulverising Mills (Pvt.) Ltd., 1074, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	Methyl parathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2865-1964	
106. CM/L-2170 10-12-1969	16-9-1972	30-9-1973	Jayalakshmi Fertilizers, G.N.T. Madhavaram, Madras-60	DDT dusting powders— IS : 564-1961	
107. CM/L-2172 10-12-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Tata Fison Industries Ltd., 20 Howrah Road, Salkia, Howrah	BHC emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 632-1966	
108. CM/L-2173 10-12-1969	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	DDT emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 633-1956	
109. CM/L-2228 29-1-1970	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	Anant Industries (Regd), Near M-30, Industrial Area, Jullundur City	(a) Carpenter's metal bodied smooth bench planes, nominal size 45, 50 and 60 mm only (b) Carpenter's metal bodied jack bench planes, nominal size 50 and 60 mm only and (c) Carpenter's metal bodied for bench planes, nominal size 60 mm only— IS : 4057-1967	
110. CM/L-2230 3-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulverising Mills (Pvt.) Ltd., 1074, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	DDT emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 633-1956	
111. CM/L-2231 3-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	Aldrin dusting powders— IS : 1308-1959	
112. CM/L-2236 9-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	BHC emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 632-1966	
113. CM/L-2237 9-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	Aldrin emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 1307-1958	
114. CM/L-2266 27-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Jayalakshmi Fertilizers, G.N.T. Road, Madhavaram, Madras-60	BHC water dispersible powder concentrates— IS : 562-1962	
115. CM/L-2267 27-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 1310-1958	
116. CM/L-2268 27-2-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulverising Mills Pvt. Ltd., 1074, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	Endosulphan emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 4323-1967	
117. CM/L-2282 18-3-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	Malathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2567-1963	
118. CM/L-2289 24-3-1970	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	Paramount Meters Pvt. Ltd., Pandit Nehru Jamnagar (Gujarat)	Water meters (domestic type), dry-dial, inferential, Type A, 15 mm and 25 mm Magsizes— IS : 779-1968	
119. CM/L-2294 31-3-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	A. Paul Instruments Co. Jind (Haryana)	General purposes glass thermometers— IS : 2480-1964	
120. CM/L-2312 27-4-1970	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	U.K. Paint Industries, G.T. Road, Amritsar	Putty for use on metal frames— IS : 419-1967	
121. CM/L-2323 15-5-1970	1-9-1972	28-2-1973	Commercial Timber Industries, Khajuri Road, Yamunanagar, Distt. Ambala (Haryana)	Plywood tea-chest battens— IS : 10-1970	
122. CM/L-2325 19-5-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Jayalakshmi Fertilizers, G.N.T. Road, Madhavaram, Madras-60	Malathion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2567-1963	
123. CM/L-2356 1-7-1970	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	K.R. Steel Union P. Ltd., 16-D, Industrial Area, Kalyani, Distt. Nadia (W. Bengal)	Coal twisted plain steel bars— IS : 1786-1966	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
124. CM/L-2399 31-8-1970		1-9-1972	31-8-1973	Gannon Dunkerley & Co. Ltd., Old B.P.T. Road, Mahul, Bombay-74 AS	Welded low carbon steel gas cylinders of 33.3 litres water capacity for the storage and transportation of low pressure liquefiable gases— IS : 3196-1968
125. CM/L-2405 11-9-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulverising Mills (Pvt.) Ltd., 1074, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	Wettable sulphur powder— IS : 3383-1965
126. CM/L-2406 11-9-1970		16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Jayalakshmi Agro Chemicals, Amara-vathi Road, Gorantla Village, Limites P.O., Guntur-2, Guntur Distt. (Andhra Pradesh)	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962
127. CM/L-2409 28-9-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Continental Industries, Opp : Lal Bahadur Shastri Stadium, Bapu Nagar, Ahmedabad-23	Metal headed frames (a) with wooden lateral support (b) with steel lateral support— IS : 4465-1970
128. CM/L-2411 28-9-1970		16-9-1972	15-9-1973	A.R. Nag Choudhury & Co., Barui-pur, P.O. Barui-pur, Distt. 24 Parganas (West Bengal)	Door closers (hydraulically regulated) — IS : 3564-1970
129. CM/L-2412 28-9-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Sunray Chemical Industries, Moti Lal Nehru Road, Agra	BHC water dispersible powder concentra-tes— IS : 562-1962
130. CM/L-2413 28-9-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Ramkrishnan Kulwantrai Steels Pvt. Ltd., 403-A, Tiruvottiyur High Road, (Next to Ajax Bus Terminus), Tiruvottiyur, Madras-19	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1969
131. CM/L-2414 28-9-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1969
132. CM/L-2417 29-9-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Dalima Biscuit Pvt. Ltd., Rajpura, Distt. Patiala (Punjab)	Biscuits— IS : 1011-1968
133. CM/L-2418 30-9-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Multiplex Agro Industries (Pvt.) Ltd., Plot No. 184/11 & 184/12, Naroda Industrial Estate, Naroda, Ahmedabad-2	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962
134. CM/L-2421 6-10-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	Endrin emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 1310-1958
135. CM/L-2425 14-10-1970		16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Narang Brewaries, Nawabganj, Distt. Gonda (UP)	Beer— IS : 3865-1966
136. CM/L-2428 19-10-1970		16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Hindustan General Industries Ltd., Nangloi, Delhi	Welded low carbon steel gas cylinder for the storage and transportation of low pressure liquefiable gases of water capacity 33.8 litres— IS : 3198-1968
137. CM/L-2429 19-10-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulverising Mills (P) Ltd., 1074, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	Fenitrothion emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 5281-1969
138. CM/L-2430 20-10-1970		16-10-1972	15-4-1973	Rockweld Electrodes India Ltd., 29, Industrial Estate, Ambattur, Madras-58	Covered electrodes for metal arc welding of structural steel— IS : 814-1970
139. CM/L-2433 21-10-1970		16-10-1972	15-10-1973	AGEW Steel Manufacturers (P) Ltd., Ambika Oil Mill Compound, Outside Gomtipur Gate, Ah-medabad-21	Steel windows and ventilators— IS : 1038-1968
140. CM/L-2442 30-10-1970		1-11-1972	31-10-1973	Vensons Agro Chemicals & Allied Industries Pvt. Ltd., Private Industrial Estate, Coimbatore	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962
141. CM/L-2443 30-10-1970		1-11-1972	31-10-1973	Bhoruka Udyog, Bara Mandir, Pani-hati, 24 Parganas	Steel drums— IS : 2552-1970
142. CM/L-2471 30-11-1970		1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Haryana Chemicals & Pesticides, T/6, Industrial Area, Bahadur-garh, Distt. Rohtak (Haryana)	BHC dusting powders— IS : 561-1962
143. CM/L-2512 20-1-1971		1-10-1972	31-3-1973	Multiweld Wire Co. (P) Ltd., 59, Marol-Maroshi Road, Marol, Bombay-59	Welded steel wire fabric for general use— IS : 4948-1968
144. CM/L-2550 19-2-1971		1-9-1972	31-8-1973	Jatindra Timber Industries, 508, Model Town, Yamunanagar, Distt. Ambala (Haryana)	Plywood tea-chest battens— IS : 10-1970

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
145. CM/L-2594 16-3-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Bharat Pulverising Mills Pvt. Ltd., 1874, Thiruvottiyur High Road, Madras-19	Dieldrin emulsifiable concentrates IS : 1054-1962	
146. CM/L-2595 16-3-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	Chlordane emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 2682-1966	
147. CM/L-2611 29-3-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	E.I.D. Parry Ltd., S. No. 38/3, Kathiuakkam Village, Ennore, Saidapet, Taluk, Madras-57	Poultry feeds— IS : 1374-1968	
148. CM/L-2612 29-3-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	-do-	Compounded feeds for cattle— IS : 2052-1968	
149. CM/-2616 29-3-1971	1-10-1972	31-10-1973	Northern India Plywood, 12/3 Mathura Road, Faridabad (Haryana)	Solid core wooden flushdoor shutters (block board core)— IS : 2202 (Part I)-1966	
150. CM/L-2626 29-3-1971	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	United Wire Ropes Ltd., Maruti- kumar Road, Panchpakhandi, Thana (Maharashtra)	Steel wire ropes for general engineering purposes— IS : 2266-1970	
151. CM/L-2642 30-3-1971	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Universal Cable Mfg. Co., Opposite Rly. Station, Faridabad	(a) Single core polyethene insulated and polyethylene sheathed, weatherproof cable, 650/1100 volts, aluminium con- ductor; (b) Single core polyethylene insulated, taped/untaped, braided and weather proof compounded, weather proof cables, 250/440 volts, aluminium con- ductor; (c) Flat twin core polyethylene insulated, polyethylene sheathed 250/440 volts, weatherproof aluminium conductor; and (d) Polyethylene insulated, taped/untaped, braided and compounded weatherproof, flat twin core, 650/1100 volts with aluminium conductor— IS : 3035 (Part II)-1965 and IS : 3035 (Part III)-1967	
152. CM/L-2740 18-8-1971	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	Indore Iron & Steel Mills, 314, Bha- girathpura, Indore City (MP)	Cold twisted deformed steel bars for concrete reinforcement— IS : 1786-1966	
153. CM/L-2741 18-8-1971	16-8-1972	15-8-1973	Hanuman Engineering Works, In- dustrial Area, Aishbagh, Lucknow	Cold twisted deformed steel bars for con- crete reinforcement (a) up to and including 14 mm dia, (under Group I) & (b) more than 14 mm dia, (under Group II)— IS : 1786-1968	
154. CM/L-2744 25-8-1971	1-9-1972	15-3-1973	Tudiyalur Co-operative Agricultural Services Ltd., Tudiyalur P.O. Coimbatore-11	BHC water dispersible powders — IS : 562-1962	
155. CM/L-2745 25-8-1971	1-9-1972	15-3-1973	-do-	DDT water dispersible powders— IS : 565-1961	
156. CM/L-2750 26-8-1971	1-9-1972	15-3-1973	The Mysore Iron & Steel Ltd., Bhadravati, (Mysore State)	Carbon steel billets for re-rolling into st- ructural steel (standard quality)— IS : 2830-1964	
157. CM/L-2751 26-8-1971	1-9-1972	15-3-1973	-do-	Carbon steel billets for re-rolling into structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 2831-1969	
158. CM/L-2758 7-9-1971	16-9-1972	30-9-1973	Multiplex Agro Industries (Pvt.) Ltd., Plot No. 184/11 & 12, Naroda Industrial Estate, Na- roda, Ahmedabad-2	Aldrin dusting powders— IS : 1308-1958	
159. CM/L-2760 13-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Allied Industrial Traders, 55B, Wazir Hasan Road, Lucknow-1	Single barrel strirrup pump— IS : 1971-1965	
160. CM/L-2762 13-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Jolly Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd., 32, Nagar Road, Poona-14	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1969	
161. CM/L-2763 13-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	-do-	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1969	
162. CM/L-2767 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	Pilsner Breweries India Ltd., Arlem Unit, Arlem, Margao-Borim Road, Margao, Goa	Beer— IS : 3865-1966	
163. CM/L-2768 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	Bangalore Pesticides Ltd., 10th Milestone, Tumkur Road, Ban- galore-22	BHC water dispersible powders— IS : 562-1962	

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
164.	CM/L-2769 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-3-1973	Bangalore Pesticides Ltd. 10th Milestone, Tumkur Road, Bangalore-22	DDT water dispersible powders— IS : 565-1961
165.	CM/L-2770 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	-do-	COC water dispersible powders— IS : 1507-1966
166.	CM/L-2771 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-10-1973	Industrial Minerals & Chemicals Co. Pvt. Ltd., Kurla Marol Road, Andheri, Bombay-58	Thiometon emulsifiable concentrates— IS : 3905-1966
167.	CM/L-2772 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-10-1973	Industrial Minerals & Chemical Co. Pvt. Ltd., Kurla Marol Road, Chakala, Bombay-69	Dichlorvos emulsifiable concentrates - IS : 5277-1969
168.	CM/L-2773 16-9-1971	16-9-1972	15-9-1973	The Angus Co. Ltd., P.O. Angus, Hooghly	(a) DW-flour jute cloth— IS : 3966-1967 and (b) DW-flour bags— IS : 3984-1967
169.	CM/L-2776 27-9-1971	1-10-1972	30-9-1973	Ahmedabad Steelcrafts & Rolling Mills, Near Odhav Bus Stand, Ahmedabad-21	Rolled steel sections, F7B for doors, windows and ventilators— IS : 1038-1968
170.	CM/L-2778 6-10-1971	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Prakash Saw Mills, Main Road, Kallettumkara P.O., Near Irinjalakadu Rly. Station, Distt. Trichur (Kerala)	Tea-chest battens— IS : 10-1970
171.	CM/L-2779 8-10-1971	16-10-1972	15-10-1973	Lekhapani Veneer & Saw Mills, P.O. Lekhapani, Via Ledo (Assam)	Tea-chest plywood panels— IS : 10-1970
172.	CM/L-2784 21-10-1971	1-11-1972	31-10-1973	N.T. Bethan Chettiar & Co., Post Box No. 14, 21 Mount Road, Coonoor-2 (Nilgiris)	Tea-chest metal fittings— IS : 10-1970

[No. CMD/13 : 12]

क्र० प्र० 1066 :—समय-समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 5 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन भारतीय मानकों के खोरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिये गये हैं, वे रद्द कर दिये गये हैं :—

## अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	रद्द किये गये भारतीय मानक का पदनाम और शीर्षक	भारत के राजपत्र की एस ओ सं० और तिथि जिसमें भारतीय मानक के निर्धारण सम्बन्धी सूचना छपी थी	विवरण
1	2	3	4
1.	IS : 353-1952 हवा में सूखने वाली, साफ, अत-ऐस्करोहली रोधक वार्निश की विशिष्टि ।	भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खण्ड-3, दिनांक 26 मार्च, 1955 में एस ओ सं० 658, दिनांक 26 मार्च, 1955 के अन्तर्गत प्रकाशित ।	IS : 352-1973—बिजली के कार्यों के लिये हवा में सूखने वाली रोधक वार्निश की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण), के प्रकाशित होने के कारण रद्द कर दिया गया है ।
2.	IS : 509-1953 ग्रीज एल सं० 4 की विशिष्टि	भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खण्ड 3, दिनांक 26 मार्च, 1955 में एस ओ सं० 658, दिनांक 26 मार्च, 1955 के अन्तर्गत प्रकाशित ।	IS : 506-1973 मोटर गाड़ियों के लिए ग्रीजों की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण) के प्रकाशन के कारण रद्द कर दिया गया है ।

[सं० सी. एस. डी. 13 : 7]

ए० पी० बनर्जी, उपमहानिदेशक

S.O. 1066 :—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 5 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, it is, hereby notified that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are mentioned in the Schedule given hereafter, have been cancelled :—

## SCHEDULE

S. No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standard Cancelled	S.O. No. and Date of Gazette Notification in which Establishment of the Indian Standard was Notified	Remarks
1	2	3	4
1.	IS : 353-1952 Specification for insulating varnish, non-alcoholic, clear, air-drying	S.R.O. 658, dated 26 March, 1955 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, dated 26 March, 1955.	Cancelled in view of publication of IS : 352-1973 Specification for air-drying insulating varnishes for electrical purposes. (first revision)
2.	IS : 509-1953 Specification for grease L No. 4	-do-	Cancelled in view of publication of IS : 506-1973 Specification for automotive greases (first revision)

[No. CMD/13 : 7]

A. P. BANERJEE, Deputy Director General.

**परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग**

बम्बई-1, 10. अप्रैल, 1974

**आदेश**

का० प्रा० 1067. :-राष्ट्रपति, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियन्त्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उपनियम (2), नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) के खण्ड (ख) और नियम 24 के उप-नियम (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये एतत् द्वारा निदेश देते हैं कि परमाणु ऊर्जा विभाग द्वारा जारी किये गये भारत सरकार के आदेश सं० का० प्रा० 5187 दिनांक 3 दिसम्बर, 1970 में, जो कि 27 नवम्बर, 1971

के भारत के राजपत्र के भाग दो, खण्ड तीन, उप-खण्ड (II) में प्रकाशित हुआ है, निम्नलिखित संशोधन किये जायेंगे, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में:—

(1) भाग 1 साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग II में:—

(क) मद “(V) राजस्थान परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद” तथा उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात्:—

“(V) राजस्थान परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद

वैज्ञानिक तकनीकी एवं प्रशासनिक मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर पद मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर सभी”;

(ख) मद “(VI) विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग के पद” तथा उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात्:—

“(VI) विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग के पद (इंजीनियरी प्रभाग)

वैज्ञानिक, तकनीकी एवं प्रशासनिक पद उप-निदेशक उप-निदेशक सभी”;

(ग) मद “(VII) मद्रास परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद” तथा उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात्:—

“(VII) मद्रास परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद

वैज्ञानिक, तकनीकी प्रशासनिक पद उप-निदेशक विद्युत परियोजना इंजी- उप-निदेशक विद्युत परियोजना इंजी- सभी”;  
नियरी प्रभाग नियरी प्रभाग

(घ) मद (X-ग) तथा उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के बाद, निम्नलिखित मद शामिल किये जायें, अर्थात्:—

“(X-घ) परमाणु विद्युत प्राधिकरण के पद (केन्द्रीय कार्यालय)

प्रशासनिक पद अध्यक्ष तथा मुख्य कार्यपालक अध्यक्ष तथा मुख्य कार्यपालक सभी”;

(2) ‘भाग II, साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग III में,—

(क) मद “(V) राजस्थान परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद” तथा उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात्:—

“(V) राजस्थान परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद

(क) वैज्ञानिक एवं तकनीकी पद मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर सभी ; उप-निदेशक विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग

(ख) प्रशासनिक पद मुख्य प्रशासन अधिकारी मुख्य प्रशासन अधिकारी सभी ; मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर”;

(ख) मद “(VII) विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग के पद” के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात्:—

“(VII) विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग के पद (इंजीनियरी प्रभाग)

(क) वैज्ञानिक एवं तकनीकी पद प्रधान डिजाइन इंजीनियर प्रधान डिजाइन इंजीनियर सभी उप-निदेशक

(ख) प्रशासनिक पद मुख्य प्रशासन-अधिकारी मुख्य प्रशासन-अधिकारी सभी उप-निदेशक”;

(ग) मद “(VIII) मद्रास परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद,” तथा उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात्:—

“(VIII) मद्रास परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद

(क) वैज्ञानिक एवं तकनीकी पद उप-मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर उप-मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर सभी उप-निदेशक विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग

(ख) प्रशासनिक पद मुख्य प्रशासन-अधिकारी मुख्य प्रशासन-अधिकारी सभी उप-निदेशक विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग”;

(घ) मद (XII-ग) तथा उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के बाद, निम्नलिखित मद शामिल किया जाये, अर्थात्:—

“(XII-घ) परमाणु विद्युत प्राधिकरण के पद (केन्द्रीय कार्यालय)

प्रशासनिक पद मुख्य प्रशासनिक एवं लेखा अधिकारी मुख्य प्रशासनिक एवं लेखा-अधिकारी सभी अध्यक्ष तथा मुख्य प्रशासक”;

(3) "भाग III माध्याम केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग IV में—

(क) मद "(V) राजस्थान परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद" तथा उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात् :—

"(V) राजस्थान परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद

प्रशासनिक एवं तकनीकी पद मुख्य प्रशासनिक अधिकारी मुख्य प्रशासनिक अधिकारी सभी मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर";

(ख) मद "(VII) विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग के पद" तथा उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात् :—

(VII) विद्युत परियोजना इंजीनियरी प्रभाग के पद इंजीनियरी प्रभाग

(क) तकनीकी पद प्रशासन अधिकारी प्रशासन अधिकारी सभी प्रधान डिजाइन इंजीनियर

(ख) प्रशासनिक पद प्रशासन अधिकारी प्रशासन अधिकारी सभी मुख्य प्रशासनिक अधिकारी";

(ग) मद "(VIII) मद्रास परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद" तथा उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात् :—

"(VIII) मद्रास परमाणु विद्युत परियोजना के पद"

(क) तकनीकी पद प्रशासन अधिकारी प्रशासन अधिकारी सभी उप-मुख्य परियोजना इंजीनियर

(ख) प्रशासनिक पद प्रशासन अधिकारी प्रशासन अधिकारी सभी मुख्य प्रशासन अधिकारी";

(घ) मद (XII-ग) तथा उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित मद प्रतिस्थापित किया जाये, अर्थात् :—

"(XII-घ) परमाणु विद्युत प्राधिकरण के पद (केन्द्रीय कार्यालय)

प्रशासनिक पद प्रशासन अधिकारी प्रशासन-अधिकारी सभी मुख्य प्रशासन एवं लेखा-अधिकारी;

[सं० 22 (1)/68-प्रशासन]

सुधीर कुमार चौधरी, अवर सचिव

## DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Bombay-1, 10 April, 1974

### ORDER

S.O. 1067.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965, the President hereby directs that the following amendments shall be made in the Order of the Government of India in the Department of Atomic Energy No. S.O. 5187 dated 3rd December, 1970, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated the 27th November, 1971, namely :—

In the Schedule to the said notification—

(1) in 'Part I—General Central Service, Class II'—

(a) for item "(v) Posts in the Rajasthan Atomic Power Project" and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

"(v) Posts In Rajasthan Atomic Power Project

Scientific, Techni- Chief Project Chief Project All";  
cal and Administ- Engineer Engineer  
rative posts

(b) for item "(vi) Posts in Power Project Engineering Division" and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

"(vi) Posts In Power Projects Engineering Division (Engineering Division)

Scientific, Techni- Deputy Director Deputy Director All";  
cal and Administ-  
rative posts

(c) for item "(vii) Posts in Madras Atomic Power Project" and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

"(vii) Posts In Madras Atomic Power Project

Scientific, Techni- Deputy Director Deputy Director All";  
cal Administrative Power Projects Director  
posts Engineering Power Projects  
Division Engineering  
Division

(d) after item (X-C) and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be inserted, namely :—

"(X-D) Posts In Atomic Power Authority (Central Office)

Administrative Chairman-cum- Chairman-cum- All";  
posts Chief Chief  
Executive Executive

(2) In 'Part II,—General Central Service, Class III',—

(a) for item "(v) Posts in Rajasthan Atomic Power Project" and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

"(v) Posts in Rajasthan Atomic Power Project

(a) Scientific and Technical posts Chief Project Engineer Chief Project Engineer All Deputy Director, Power Projects Engineering Division

(b) Administrative posts Chief Administrative Officer Chief Administrative Officer All Chief Project Engineer";

(b) for item "(vii) Posts in Power Projects Engineering Division", the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

"(vii) Posts In Power Projects Engineering Division (Engineering Division)

(a) Scientific and Technical posts Principal Design Engineer Principal Design Engineer All Deputy Director

(b) Administrative posts	Chief Administrative Officer	Chief Administrative Officer	All	Deputy Director";
--------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-----	-------------------

(c) for item "(viii) Posts in Madras Atomic Power Project" and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

**"(viii) Posts in Madras Atomic Power Project"**

(a) Scientific and Technical posts	Deputy Chief Project Engineer	Deputy Chief Project Engineer	All	Deputy Director, Power Projects Engineering Division
(b) Administrative posts	Chief Administrative Officer	Chief Administrative Officer	All	Deputy Projects Director, Power Engineering Division";

(d) after item (XII-C) and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be inserted, namely :—

**"(XII-D) Posts in Atomic Power Authority (Central Office)"**

Administrative posts	Chief Administrative and Accounts Officer	Chief Administrative and Accounts Officer	All	Chairman-cum-Chief Executive";
----------------------	---	---	-----	--------------------------------

(3) in 'Part III—General Central Service, Class IV'—

(a) for item "(v) Posts in the Rajasthan Atomic Power Project" and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

**"(v) Posts in Rajasthan Atomic Power Project"**

Administrative and Technical posts	Chief Administrative Officer	Chief Administrative Officer	All	Chief Project Engineer";
------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	-----	--------------------------

(b) for item "(vii) Posts in Power Projects Engineering Division" and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

**"(vii) Posts in Power Projects (Engineering Division) Engineering Division"**

(a) Technical posts	Administrative Officer	Administrative Officer	All	Principal Design Engineer
(b) Administrative posts	Administrative Officer	Administrative Officer	All	Chief Administrative Officer";

(c) for item "(viii) Posts in Madras Atomic Power Project" and the entries relating thereto, the following item shall be substituted, namely :—

**"(viii) Posts in Madras Atomic Power Project"**

(a) Technical posts	Administrative Officer	Administrative Officer	All	Dy. Chief Project Engineer
(b) Administrative posts	Administrative Officer	Administrative Officer	All	Chief Administrative Officer";

(d) after item (XII-C) and the entries relating thereto, the following items shall be inserted, namely :—

**"(XII-D) Posts in Atomic Power Authority (Central Office)"**

Administrative posts	Administrative Officer	Administrative Officer	All	Chief Administrative and Accounts Officer."
----------------------	------------------------	------------------------	-----	---

[No. 22 (1)/68—Adm]

S. K. Chaudhary, Under Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय

(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 11 अप्रैल, 1974

अनुसूची

प्राधिकारी	पता	क्षेत्रीय क्षेत्राधिकारी
1	2	3
श्री विजयसिंह रामसिंह परमार, सम्पर्क अधिकारी	भारतीय तेल निगम लि० मलाया, कोयाली मधुरा पारंपलाइन प्रायोजना "डोली" 33/वीहनिह गोगाहटी, कलाबड मार्ग, राजकोट (गुजरात राज्य)	गुजरात राज्य

क्र० आ० 1068.—पेट्रोलियम पारंपलाइन (भूमि के उपभाग के अधि-कार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) के खण्ड 2 की धारा (क) के अनुसरण से केन्द्रीय सरकार नीचे दी गई अनुसूची के कालम (1) में उल्लिखित प्राधिकारी को उक्त अनुसूची के कालम (3) की तदनुसूची प्रविष्टि में उल्लिखित राज्य की सीमाओं के भीतर उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत सक्षम प्राधिकारी के कार्य करने के लिये एतद्-द्वारा प्राधिकृत करती है :

[संख्या 12017/1/74-एस एण्ड एस]

डी० आर भट्टा, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM &amp; CHEMICALS

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 11th April, 1974

## NOTIFICATION

S.O. 1068.—In pursuance of clause (a) of Section 2 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby authorises the authority mentioned in Column (1) of the Schedule below to perform the functions of the Competent Authority under the said Act, within the limits of the State mentioned in the corresponding entry in column (3) of the said Schedule.

## SCHEDULE

Authority	Address	Territorial Jurisdiction
(1)	(2)	(3)
Shri Vijaysingh Ramsingh Parmar, Liaison Officer	Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., Salaya-Koyali-Mathura Pipeline Project "DOLI" 33/B Hari Har Society, Kalavad Road, Rajkot, (Gujarat State).	State of Gujarat

[No. 12017/1/74-L&amp;L]

B. R. Bhalla, Under Secy.

## नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय

(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली 15 अप्रैल, 1974

का०प्रा० 1069.—नाविक भविष्य निधि योजना 1966 के पैरा 37 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा भारत सरकार नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय (परिवहन पक्ष) की अधिसूचना सं० सा० प्रा० 2604 दिनांक 31-8-1973 के साथ पठित अधिसूचना सं० सा० प्रा० 1430 दिनांक 28-4-1973 को अतिक्रमण करते हुए, नाविक भविष्य निधि के न्यामियों के बोर्ड के माध्यम से और अपने साधारण प्रशासनिक व्यय पूरे करने के लिये उपलब्ध धन के संसाधनों को दृष्टि में रखते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा 1 अप्रैल, 1974 से उक्त योजना के पैरा 35 के अन्तर्गत वेय प्रशासनिक प्रभार 1½ प्रतिशत निर्धारित करती है।

[सं० 5-एम० टी० (3)/72]

वि० वि० सुब्रह्मण्यम उप-सचिव,

## MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 15th April, 1974

S.O. 1069.—In exercise of the powers conferred by paragraph 37 of the Seamen's Provident Fund Scheme, 1966, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Shipping and Transport (Transport Wing) No. S.O. No. 1430 dated the 28th April, 1973 read with their notification No. S.O. 2604, dated the 31st August, 1973, the Central Government in consultation with the Board of Trustees of the Seamen's Provident Fund and having regard to the resources of the Fund available for meeting its normal administrative expenses, hereby fixes, with effect from the 1st April, 1974 the administrative charges payable under paragraph 35 of the said Scheme, at 1-3/4 per cent.

[No. 5-MT(3)/72]

V. V. SUBRAHMANYAM, Dy. Secy.

## रेल मंत्रालय

(रेलवे बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 1974

का०प्रा० 1070.—रेल यात्रियों पर सीमाकर अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 69) की धारा 4 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड) की 3 जनवरी, 1974 की अधिसूचना संख्या एक (एक्स) I-73/5/6-ए का अतिक्रमण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा निवेश देती है कि इसके साथ संलग्न अनुसूची में उल्लिखित अधिसूचित स्थान से/तक रेलवे द्वारा यात्रा करने वाले किसी यात्री पर, ऐसे अधिसूचित स्थान से चौबीस किलोमीटर के व्यास के भीतर स्थित किसी रेलवे स्टेशन तक/से, सीमाकर नहीं लगाया जायेगा।

2 यह अधिसूचना 1 मई, 1974 से प्रवृत्त होगी।

## अनुसूची

## 1. जवालापुर

[सं० एक (एक्स) I-73/5/6-1]

## MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 1974

S.O. 1070.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Terminal Tax on Railway Passengers Act, 1956 (69 of 1956), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) No. F(X)I-73/5/6-A dated the 3rd January, 1974, the Central Government hereby directs that no terminal tax shall be levied on any passenger travelling by railway from or to the notified place mentioned in the Schedule annexed hereto, to or from any railway station situated within a radius of twenty-four kilometres from such notified place.

2. This notification shall have effect on and from the 1st May, 1974.

## SCHEDULE

## 1. JAWALAPUR.

[No. F (X) I-73/5/6-1]

का०प्रा० 1071.—रेल यात्रियों पर सीमाकर अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 69) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार, रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड) की दिनांक 21 मार्च, 1974 की अधिसूचना संख्या एक (एक्स) I-74/7/1-I के साथ पठित भारत सरकार, रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड) की अधिसूचना सं० एक (एक्स) 1-73/5/6-बी का अतिक्रमण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा :—

(क) इस अधिसूचना के साथ संलग्न अनुसूची के कालम I में उल्लिखित दूरें निश्चित करती हैं। इन्हीं दूरों के अनुसार उक्त अनुसूची के कालम I में बिनिर्दिष्ट अधिसूचित स्थान से/तक रेलवे द्वारा ले जाये जाने वाले सभी यात्रियों के प्रत्येक रेलवे टिकट पर सीमाकर लगाया जायेगा; और

(ख) यह निदेश देती है कि उपर्युक्त सीमाकर 1 मई, 1974 से उद्घाट्य होगा।

2. यह अधिसूचना 1 मई, 1974 को प्रवृत्त होगी।



अनुसूची				
I		II		
क्रम	अधिसूचित संख्या	एक श्रोर के प्रत्येक टिकट पर सीमाकर की दरें		
स्थानों के नाम	वर्ग	वयस्क	3 से 12 वर्ष तक के बच्चे	

1. हरिद्वार	थोड़ी दूरी के	लम्बी दूरी के	थोड़ी दूरी के	लम्बी दूरी के
2. नियर टनल	यात्रियों के लिए	यात्रियों के लिए	यात्रियों के लिए	यात्रियों के लिए
3. भीम गोडा टैंक	(25 कि.मी.	(25 कि.मी.	(242 कि.मी.	242 कि.मी.
4. ज्वालापुर	से 242 कि.मी.)	से आगे	से 242 कि.मी.	से आगे

	₹० पैसे	₹० पैसे	₹० पैसे	₹० पैसे
वातानुकूल दर्जा या पहला दर्जा	1.10	1.50	0.55	0.75

I		II			
वातानुकूल कुर्सी	1.10	1.59	0.55	0.75	
यान					
दूसरा दर्जा	0.25	0.35	0.15	0.20	

व्याख्या—वापसी टिकट पर सीमाकर अनुसूची में निर्धारित दर से दुगुना होगा।

[सं० एफ(एक्स)I-73/5/6-II]

S.O. 1071.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Terminal Tax on Railway Passengers Act, 1956 (69 of 1956), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) No. F(X)I-73/5/6-B dated the 3rd January, 1974, read with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) No. F(X)I-74/7/1-I dated the 21st March, 1974, the Central Government hereby:—

(a) fixes the rates mentioned in column II of the Schedule annexed hereto as the rates at which terminal tax shall be levied in respect of every railway ticket on all passengers carried by railway from or to the notified places specified in column I of the said Schedule, and

(b) directs that the aforesaid terminal tax shall be leviable with effect from the 1st May, 1974.

2. This notification shall come into force on the 1st May, 1974.

#### SCHEDULE

I		II			
Sl. Name of notified No. places		Rates of terminal tax per single ticket			
		Adults		Children between 3 & 12 years of age	
		Short distance passengers (25 Kms-242 Kms)	Long distance passengers Beyond 242 Kms	Short distance passengers 25 Kms-242 Kms	Long distance passengers Beyond 242 Kms
		Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.	Rs. P.
1. Hardwar	Air conditioned class or I Class	1-10	1-50	0-55	0-75
2. Near Tunnel	Air-conditioned chair car Class	1-10	1-50	0-55	0-75
3. Bhimgoda Tank	II Class	0-25	0-35	0-15	0-20
4. Jawalapur					

Explanation :—The Terminal Tax on a return ticket shall be double the rates fixed herein. [No.F(X)I-73/5/6-II]

का०अ० 1072.—भारत सरकार, रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड) की विनांक 21 मार्च, 1974 की अधिसूचना संख्या एफ (एक्स) 1-74/7/1-1 के साथ पठित यात्रियों पर, सीमाकर अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 69) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा:—

(क) इस अधिसूचना के साथ संलग्न अनुसूची के कालम II में उल्लिखित दरें निर्दिष्ट करती हैं। इन्हीं दरों के अनुसार उक्त अनुसूची के कालम I में विनिर्दिष्ट अधिसूचित स्थान से/तक रेलवे द्वारा ले जाये जाने वाले सभी यात्रियों के प्रत्येक रेलवे टिकट पर सीमाकर लगाया जायेगा; और

(ख) यह निवेदन देती है कि उपर्युक्त सीमाकर 1 मई, 1974 से उद्घाटित होगा।

2. यह अधिसूचना 1 मई, 1974 को प्रवृत्त होगी।

#### अनुसूची

I		II			
क्रम	अधिसूचित संख्या	एक श्रोर के प्रत्येक टिकट पर सीमाकर की दरें			
स्थान का नाम		वयस्क	3 से 12 वर्ष तक के बच्चे		
1. श्रुपिकेय	दर्जा	थोड़ी दूरी के यात्रियों के लिए	लम्बी दूरी के यात्रियों के लिए	थोड़ी दूरी के यात्रियों के लिए	लम्बी दूरी के यात्रियों के लिए

I	II			
	17 कि. 242 मी. से कि.मी.	17 कि. 242 मी. से कि.मी.	17 कि. 242 मी. से कि.मी.	17 कि. 242 मी. से कि.मी.
	242 से आगे कि.मी.	242 से आगे कि.मी.	242 से आगे कि.मी.	242 से आगे कि.मी.
	₹० पैसे	₹० पैसे	₹० पैसे	₹० पैसे
वातानुकूल या या पहला दर्जा	0.40	0.70	0.20	0.35
वातानुकूल कुर्सी या दूसरा दर्जा	0.40	0.70	0.20	0.35
	0.15	0.20	0.05	0.10

व्याख्या—वापसी टिकट पर सीमाकर वही होगा जैसा कि अनुसूची में निर्धारित है।

[सं० एफ (एकम) I-73/5/6-III]  
अमृत लाल गुप्ता, सचिव

S.O. 1072.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Terminal Tax on Railway Passengers Act, 1956 (69 of 1956), read with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) No. F(X)I-74/7/1-I dated the 21st March, 1974 the Central Government hereby :—

(a) fixes the rates mentioned in column II of the Schedule annexed hereto as the rates at which terminal tax shall be levied in respect of every railway ticket on all passengers carried by railway from or to the notified place specified in column I of the said Schedule, and

(b) directs that the aforesaid terminal tax shall be leviable with effect from the 1st May, 1974.

2. This notification shall come into force on the 1st May, 1974.

#### SCHEDULE

I	II	Rates of terminal tax per single ticket			
		Adults		Children between 3 & 12 years of age	
S. No. Name of notified place	Class of accommodation	Short distance passengers	Long distance passengers	Short distance passengers	Long distance passengers
		17 Kms-242 Kms	Beyond 242 Kms	17-Kms-242 Kms	Beyond 242 Kms
1. Rishikesh	Air-conditioned class or I Class	Rs. P 0-40	Rs. P 0-70	Rs. P 0-20	Rs. P 0-35
	Air-conditioned chair car class	0-40	0-70	0-20	0-35
	II Class	0-15	0-20	0-05	0-10

Explanation :—The Terminal Tax on a return ticket shall be the same as fixed herein.

[No.F(X)I-73/5-6-III]  
A.L. GUPTA, Secretary.

#### सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली 30 मार्च, 1974

का०प्रा० 1073.—चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 5(1) और चलचित्र (सेंसर) नियमावली, 1958 के नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2) के साथ पठित नियम 8 के उप-नियम (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुये, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड से परामर्श करके एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को 1 अप्रैल, 1974 से 30 जून, 1974 तक उक्त बोर्ड के बम्बई सलाहकार पैनल का फिर से सदस्य नियुक्त किया है :—

1. श्री कमलेश्वर
2. प्रो० के० जी० भ्रमवाल
3. श्री एस० एस० रेगे
4. प्रो० (श्रीमती) विजया राजाध्याय
5. श्री डी० जी० नाथकर्णी
6. प्रो० मुरली ठाकुर
7. डा० (श्रीमती) चारशीला बी० गुप्त

8. श्री जी० के० दुतिया
9. श्रीमती कमला तिलक
10. श्रीमती पद्मा के० वेसाई
11. डा० (कुमारी) लक्ष्मि एस० सोमेजी
12. श्रीमती नलिनी एस० सुखर्कर
13. श्रीमती मणिबेन देसाई
14. श्रीमती टी० बी० बेहेजिया
15. श्रीमती लक्ष्मी बाही
16. श्री एस० डी० शाह
17. श्री गंगाराम जोशी
18. श्री राम नारंग
19. श्री एस० ई० हसनेम
20. श्रीमती कमला दुग्गा
21. श्रीमती तलाक्षी शाह
22. श्री राजनारायण सिंह
23. श्रीमती आर० एस० बोगा
24. श्री रसिक जे० शाह
25. श्रीमती मृणासिनी चौकसी

26. श्रीमती ललिता एन० बापट
27. श्रीमती एस गुलराजानी
28. श्रीमती बीना सेठी
29. श्रीमती मास्ती गिलानी
30. श्रीमती आशा सेठ
31. श्रीमती मजुं प्रमथाल
32. श्री जोए अन्सारी
33. श्रीमती उर्मिला कपूर
34. श्री डी० पी० आनन्द

[फा० संख्या 11/3/72-एफ० सी०]

### MINISTRY OF INFORMATION & BROADCASTING

New Delhi, the 30th March, 1974

**S.O. 1073.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule 2 of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby re-appoints the following persons after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors, as members of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Bombay with effect from 1st April, 1974 upto 30th June, 1974:—

1. Shri Kamaleshwar
2. Prof. K. G. Aggarwal
3. Shri S. S. Rage
4. Prof. (Smt.) Vijaya Rajadhyaksha
5. Shri D. G. Nadkarni
6. Prof. Murli Thakur
7. Dr. (Smt.) Charusheela B. Gupta
8. Shri G. K. Dutia
9. Smt. Kamala Tilak
10. Smt. Padma K. Desai
11. Dr. (Miss) Labuben S. Soneji
12. Smt. Nalini S. Sukthankar
13. Smt. Maniben Desai
14. Smt. T. V. Dehejia
15. Smt. Laxmi Wahl
16. Shri S. D. Shah
17. Shri Ganga Ram Joshi
18. Shri Rama Narang
19. Shri S. E. Hassnain
20. Smt. Kamala Dua
21. Shri Talakshi Shah
22. Shri Rajnarain Singh
23. Smt. R. S. Boga
24. Shri Rasik J. Shah
25. Smt. Mrinalini Choksi
26. Smt. Lalita N. Bapat
27. Smt. S. Gulrajani
28. Smt. Veena Sethi
29. Smt. Malati Gilani
30. Smt. Asha Sheth
31. Smt. Manju Agarwal
32. Shri Zoe Ansari
33. Smt. Urmila Kapoor
34. Shri D. P. Anand

[F. No. 11/3/72-FC]

**का०प्रा० 1074.**—चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 5(1) और चलचित्र (सेन्सर) नियमावली, 1958 के नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2) के साथ पठित नियम 8 के उप-नियम (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकांशों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेन्सर बोर्ड से परामर्श करने के बाद, एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को 1 अप्रैल, 1974 से 30 जून, 1974 तक, उक्त बोर्ड के मद्रास सलाहकार पैनल का सदस्य फिर से नियुक्त किया है:—

1. श्री टी० नीलकन्तन
2. श्रीमती सोन्ना कैलासम
3. श्री पकाला सूर्य नारायण राव
4. श्री मोहम्मद युसुफ कोकण
5. श्री एम० गोविन्दन
6. श्रीमती सी० एल० मीनाक्षी अम्मा
7. श्री पी० बी० चलपत्तेश्वर राय
8. श्रीमती मेरी क्लबवाला आदव
9. श्री पी० के० रामलिंगम
10. श्री जी० वरदप्पा
11. श्रीमती आर० सुवर्ण
12. श्रीमती पी० बी० भागीरथ
13. श्रीमती बर्षा लोबो
14. श्रीमती इन्दिरा डी० कोठारी
15. श्रीमती मालती बेन्दूर
16. श्री सी० आर० शर्मा
17. श्रीमती राजी रंगाचारी
18. श्रीमती पद्मिनी अच्युता मेनन
19. श्रीमती एन० एस० मणि
20. डा० एस० ब्रिजयालक्ष्मी
21. श्रीमती सीला पार्थसारथी
22. कुमारी पी० शान्ताबाई
23. श्रीमती एम० सीलावती
24. श्रीमती रोहिणी कृष्णचन्द्र
25. डा० (कुमारी) सी० एम० सीलावती
26. श्रीमती हेमलता अजनेयुषु
27. श्रीमती सारा सैयद यूसूफ
28. श्रीमती जी० दुबे
29. श्रीमती पद्मा सबानन्द

[सं० एफ० 11/4/72-एफ० सी०]

**S.O. 1074.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952, and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with Sub-rule (2) of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby re-appoints the following persons after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors, as members of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Madras with effect from 1st April, 1974 upto 30th June, 1974:—

1. Shri T. Neelakanthan
2. Smt. Soundra Kailasam
3. Shri Pakala Suryanarayana Rao
4. Shri Mohd. Yousuf Kokan
5. Shri M. Govindan
6. Smt. C. L. Meenakshi Amma
7. Shri P. V. Chalapatheswara Rao
8. Smt. Mary Clubwala Jadhav
9. Shri P. K. Ramalingam
10. Shri G. Varadappa

11. Smt. R. Suvarna
12. Smt. P. V. Bhagirathi
13. Smt. Bertha Lobo
14. Smt. Indira D. Kothari
15. Smt. Malati Chendur
16. Shri C. R. Sarma
17. Smt. Raji Rangachari
18. Smt. Padmini Achutha Menon
19. Smt. N. S. Mani
20. Dr. S. Vijayalakshmi
21. Smt. Leena Parthasarathi
22. Kumari P. Shanta Bai
23. Smt. M. Leelavathi
24. Smt. Rohini Krishnachandra
25. Dr. (Miss) C. M. Leclavati
26. Smt. Hemlata Anjaneyulu
27. Smt. Sata Syed Yusuff
28. Smt. G. Dubey
29. Smt. Padma Sadanandam

[F. No. 11/4/72-FC]

का० प्रा० 1075.—चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 5(1) और चलचित्र (सेंसर) नियमावली, 1958 के नियम 9 के उपनियम (2) के साथ पठित नियम 8 के उपनियम (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड से परामर्श करते के बाद एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को 1 अप्रैल, 1974 से 30 जून, 1974 तक उक्त बोर्ड के कलकत्ता सलाहकार पैनल, का फिर से सदस्य नियुक्त किया है :—

1. श्रीमती उमा सहानबीस
2. श्री सैलन मुखर्जी
3. श्रीमती अबू सईद अय्युब
4. श्रीमती काजल सेनगुप्त
5. श्रीमती शैब्या दत्त
6. श्रीमती प्राणा पूर्ण देवी
7. श्रीमती रीता रै
8. श्री सुजीत के० चक्रवर्ती
9. श्री आर० पी० गुप्त
10. श्री अनन्त महापात्रा
11. श्री सोमयेंद्र नाथ टैगोर
12. श्रीमती उषा खान
13. श्री राजेंद्र अयन दत्त
14. श्रीमती जयश्री सेन
15. श्रीमती मीनाक्षी बसु

[फा० सं० 11/5/72-एफ० सी०]

S.O. 1075.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5(1) of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 and sub-rule (3) of rule 8 read with sub-rule (2) of rule 9 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1958, the Central Government hereby re-appoints the following persons after consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors, as members of the Advisory Panel of the said Board at Calcutta with effect from 1st April, 1974 to upto 30th June, 1974 :—

1. Smt. Uma Sabanabis
2. Shri Sailen Mookerji
3. Smt. Abu Sayeed Ayyub
4. Smt. Kajal Sen Gupta
5. Smt. Shaibya Dutt
6. Smt. Asha Purna Debi

7. Smt. Rita Ray
8. Shri Sujit K. Chakrabarti
9. Shri R. P. Gupta
10. Shri Anant Mahapatra
11. Shri Saumyendra Nath Tagore
12. Smt. Usha Khan
13. Shri Ranen Ayan Dutta
14. Smt. Jayasree Sen
15. Smt. Minakshi Basu

[F. No. 11/5/72-FC]

का० प्रा० 1076.—चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों को 1 अप्रैल, 1974 से 30 जून, 1974 तक, केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड का फिर से सदस्य नियुक्त किया है :—

1. श्री बी० आर० चोपड़ा
2. श्रीमती वीना दुग्गल
3. श्रीमती सुरेन्द्र गुप्त
4. श्री पी० सी० मैथ्यू
5. श्रीमती एम० नसरुल्लाह
6. श्री बी० एन० सरकार
7. श्री ए० एल० श्रीनिवासन
8. श्री बी० सी० आर० सुन्दरम
9. श्री डेविड अब्राहम

[फा० सं० 11/6/72-एफ० सी०]

के० पी० के० नायर, अधीक्षक सचिव

S.O. 1076.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952, the Central Government hereby re-appoints the following persons as members of the Central Board of Film Censors with effect from 1st April, 1974 upto 30th June, 1974 :—

1. Shri B. R. Chopra
2. Smt. Veena Duggal
3. Smt. Surrinder Gupta
4. Shri P. C. Mathew
5. Smt. M. Nasrullah
6. Shri B. N. Sircar
7. Shri A. L. Srinivasan
8. Shri C. R. Sundaram
9. Shri David Abraham

[F. No. 11/6/72-FC]

K. P. K. NAYAR, Under Secy.

## अस संवत्सल

## आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1974

का० प्रा० 1077.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायुक्त अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट शिष्यों के बारे में मोहम्मद मकबूल, सैसर्स टाटा प्रायरन एण्ड स्टील कम्पनी लिमिटेड के आमादोबा वारिशिंग प्लांट के ठेकेदार, डाकघर जीमगोरा, जिला धनबाद, से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, सक्या 1, धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

"क्या प्रबन्धतन्त्र अर्थात् श्री मोहम्मद मकबूल, मैसर्स टाटा वाशिंग एण्ड स्टील कम्पनी लिमिटेड, के जामादोबा वाशिंग प्लांट के डेकेदार, शकधर जीलगोरा, जिला धनबाद की 8 जनवरी, 1973 में सर्वश्री रामधनी, अहमदान और अख्तर हुसैन, के काम को रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार है?"

[सक्या एल०-2012/160/73-एल० आर०-2]

करनैल सिंह, उप-सचिव

#### MINISTRY OF LABOUR

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1974

**S.O. 1077.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to Md. Maqbul, Contractor, Jamadoba Washing Plant of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Scheduled hereto annexed; And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management, namely Shri Md. Maqbul Contractor, Jamadoba Washing Plant of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad in stopping the work of Sarvashri Ramdhani, Ahswan and Akhtar Hussien with effect from the 8th January, 1973, is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

[No. L-2012/160/73-LR/II]

KARNAIL SINGH, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 अप्रैल, 1974

#### आदेश

**का० आ० 1078**—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावृद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मुम्बई पत्तन न्याय के प्रबन्धतन्त्र से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और, यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० 2, मुम्बई को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

#### अनुसूची

"क्या मुम्बई पत्तन द्वारा, सथा शर्तों में तबदीली संबंधी अपनी सूचना, तारीख 13 सितम्बर, 1973 में बूबर द्वीप पर और उसके आस-पास नौपरिवहन संबंधी विद्युत दीपों (जिसमें मुख्य दीप, बोया और संकेत दीप भी सम्मिलित है) की देखभाल करने के लिए इंजीनियर, समुद्री तेल टर्मिनल, बूबर द्वीप के अधीन बिजली-मिश्रितियों को तैनात करने के शिप्य में अधिमूर्चित तबदीलियां न्यायोचित हैं और उन्हें कार्यान्वित किया जाना चाहिए? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कार्य के लिए उक्त बिजली-मिश्रितियों को तैनात किए जाने को किस प्रकार विनियमित किया जाना चाहिए?"

[सं० एल-31011/6/74 पी एण्ड डी]

वी० शंकरालिंगम, अवसर सचिव

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 18th April, 1974

**S.O. 1078.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Bombay Port Trust and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the changes notified by the Bombay Port Trust in its Notice of Change in Service Conditions dated 13th September, 1973 in the matter of posting of electrician under the Engineer, Marine Oil Terminal, Butcher Island, for attending to navigational electric lights (including leading lights, buoys and beacons) at and around Butcher Island are justified and should be implemented. If not, how should the postings of the said electricians for the said work should be regulated?"

[No. L-31011/6/74-P&D]

V. SANKARALINGAM, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 अप्रैल, 1974

**का० आ० 1079.**—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एम० सी० मित्र-1 को उक्त अधिनियम और स्कीम और उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी, महापत्तन, खास या नौ क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से संबंधित किसी स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में या किसी ऐसे स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में जिसके एक से अधिक राज्य में विभाग या शाखाएं हों, सम्पूर्ण उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य के लिए निरीक्षण नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० ए० 12016(16)/73-सी० एफ० 1]

लालपूक शुक्ला, अवसर सचिव,

New Delhi, the 15th April, 1974

**S.O. 1079.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri N.C. Mitra-I to be an Inspector for the whole of the State of Uttar Pradesh for the purposes of the said Act, and the Scheme and the Family Pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry or in relation to an establishment having departments or branches in more than one State.

[No. A-12016(16)/73-PF.I]

LALFAK ZUALA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 16th April, 1974

**S.O. 1080.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Chandigarh in respect of a complaint under Section 33A of the said Act filed by Shri Mukhtiar Singh, Pipe Fitter which was received by the Central Government on 5th April, 1974.

BEFORE SHRI H. R. SODHI, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, (CENTRAL), CHANDIGARH

Complaint No. 2/49 of 1973

under Section 33-A of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947

Shri Mukhtiar Singh, Pipe Fitter Token No. 293-AC c/o  
BSL Workers Union Sundernagar Complainant.  
Vs.

1. Superintending Engineer BSL Admn & Accounts  
Circle, Sundernagar Respondent.
2. Executive Engineer, Field Mechanical Division No.  
II, Sundernagar (H.P.) Respondent.

Appearances :

Shri Rattan Lal—for the respondent establishment.

Shri M. S. Tugger—for the complainant.

AWARD

This complaint arises out of Reference No. 2/C of 1971. It was alleged by the complainant that his services were terminated by the respondent establishment. Pleadings were filed by the parties and issues arising therefrom were framed on 3-11-1974. The next date of hearing was fixed on 11-2-1974 at Nangal. On that date complainant was not present and without his statement the case could not proceed further. It was stated on behalf of the management that the complainant was a proclaimed offender in a case under section 307 I.P.C. To give another opportunity to the complainant, the case was adjourned to 19-3-1974 at Chandigarh. Again the complainant was not present. His authorised representative, who is president of the B.S.L. Workers Union, wanted to make a statement in support of the complaint but in the absence of the aggrieved party, the statement of the aforesaid representative of the union was without any meaning. The complaint cannot proceed in the absence of the complainant. It, therefore, stands dismissed for want of prosecution.

There is no order as to costs.

H. R. SODI, Industrial Tribunal (Central) Chandigarh.  
25-3-1974

[No. L. 42025/3/74/IRIII]

प्रवेश

का० प्रा० 1081.—यन व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा से संबंधितों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व श्रमिक यूनियन व्यास बांध प्रायोजना तलवाड़ा करती है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यनः उक्त नियोजकों और कर्मचारों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में एक लिखित करार द्वारा उक्त विवाद को उसमें वर्णित व्यक्ति के माध्यमस्व के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यमस्व करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार को भेजी गई है ;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त माध्यमस्व करार को, जो उसे 5 अप्रैल, 1974 को मिला था, एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

करार

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)

पक्षकारों के नामः—

नियोजकों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले: श्री पद्मजीत सिंह,  
सहायक कामिक अधिकारी (वैधानिक)  
व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा

कर्मचारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले: श्री बोलत सिंह बुहान, महा सचिव,  
श्रमिक यूनियन व्यास बांध प्रायोजना,  
तलवाड़ा।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित औद्योगिक विवाद को श्री जोगेन्द्र सिंह, उप श्रमायुक्त, पंजाब, चंडीगढ़ के माध्यमस्व के लिए निर्देशित करने का एतद्वारा करार किया गया है :—

- (1) विनिर्दिष्ट विवाद प्रस्त विषय: "क्या व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा के प्रबन्धतन्त्र को, श्री मिल्खी राम, जूनियर हिल्लर को 29 नवम्बर, 1972 से बेलदार के रूप में प्रत्यावर्तित करने की कार्यवाही वैधानिक और न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो वह किस अनुसूच को पाने का हकदार है ?"

विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, 1. व्यास बांध प्रायोजना, तलवाड़ा

- (2) जिसमें अन्तर्बलित स्थापन या उप-जिला होशियारपुर।  
क्रम का नाम और पता भी सम्मिलित है। 2. श्रमिक यूनियन बांध प्रायोजना तलवाड़ा जिला होशियारपुर।

- (3) यदि कोई संघ प्रशसन कर्म-श्रमिक यूनियन व्यास बांध प्रायोजना,  
कारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करता हो तो तलवाड़ा जिला होशियारपुर।  
उसका नाम

- (4) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित 16000  
कर्मचारों की कुल संख्या

- (5) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या 1  
संभाव्यतः प्रभावित होने वाले कर्म-  
कारों की प्राक्कथित संख्या

हम यह करार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्थ का विनिश्चय हम पर बाध्य कर होगा।

मध्यस्थ श्रवणा पंचाट छः मास की कालावधि या इतने और समय के भीतर जो हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय, देगा। यदि पृथ वर्णित कालावधि के भीतर पंचाट नहीं किया जाता तो

माध्यस्थम् के लिए निदेश स्वतः रह जायगा और हम नए माध्यस्थम् के लिए बातचीत करने को स्वतन्त्र रहेंगे।

ह० पद्मजीत सिंह

28-3-74

(पद्मजीत सिंह)

नियोक्ता का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले।

ह० दोलत सिंह चौहान, 28-3-74

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले।

साक्षी

1 ह०/-किरण मन्चन्दा

(किरण मन्चन्दा)

2- ह०-खुशी राम

(खुशी राम)।

[सं० एल० 42012/18/74/एल आर III]

पी० पी० कान्त, प्रवर सचिव

### ORDER

**S.O. 1081.**—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Beas Dam Project, Talwara and its workmen represented by Workers Union Beas Dam Project, Talwara.

And, whereas the said employers and workmen have, by a written agreement, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration by the person specified therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement which was received by it on the 5th April, 1974.

### AGREEMENT

(Agreement Under section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947).

Name of the parties:—

Representing employer

Shri Padamjit Singh,  
Asstt. Personnel Officer (Legal),  
Beas Dam Project, Talwara.

Representing workman

Shri Daulat Singh Chauhan,  
General Secretary,  
Workers Union Beas Dam  
Project,  
Talwara.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following Industrial dispute to the Arbitrator Shri Joginder Singh, Deputy Labour Commissioner, Punjab, Chandigarh.

- (i) Specific matter in the dispute "Whether the action of the Management of Beas Dam Project, Talwara in reverting Shri Milkhi Ram, Junior Driller as Beldar with effect from 29-11-1972 is legal & justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

- (ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the name and address of the Establishment or undertaking involved.

1. Beas Dam Project, Talwara, District Hoshiarpur.

2. Workers Union Beas Dam Project Talwara, District Hoshiarpur.

- (iii) Name of the Union, if any representing the workmen in question.

Workers Union Beas Dam Project, Talwara, District Hoshiarpur.

(iv) Total Number of workmen employed in the undertaking effected. 16000

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute: 1

We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of six months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration.

Sd/- Padamjit Singh

28/3/74

(PADAMJIT SINGH)

REPRESENTING EMPLOYER.

Sd/- DAULAT SINGH CHAUHAN

28/3/74

REPRESENTING WORKMAN.

### WITNESSES

1. Sd/- Kiran Manchanda 2. Sd/- Khushi Ram  
(KIRAN MANCHANDA). (KHUSHI RAM).

[No. L. 42012/18/74LRIII]

**S.O. 1082.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi in respect of a complaint under Section 33A of the said Act filed by Shri Dina Nath, Senior Checker which was received by the Central Government on 6th April, 1974.

BEFORE SHRI R. K. BAWEJA, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT LABOUR COURT,  
DELHI

### Present

Complaint U/s. 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Complaint I.D. No. 16 of 1974

Shri Dina Nath, Sr. Checker, C/o Director Complaint.  
Overseas Communication Service  
N.I.C. Bldg., Parliament Street, New Delhi.

### Versus

1. Shri P.G.Damle, Director General, Overseas Communication Service, Bombay.

2. Shri S. K. Raichand, Director Overseas Communications Service, N.I.C. Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi

Pt. Partap Kishan Jatley—for the respondent. Respondents.

### AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by one Shri Dina Nath against his employers the Director General, Overseas communications Service, Bombay and the Director of Overseas Communications Service, Parliament Street, New Delhi. The complaint was suspended by the respondents on the 4th of April 1973 during the pendency of proceedings under Section 33C(2) of the Act which had been initiated by the complainant against the respondents. The case of the complainant is that while suspending him no approval or permission of this Court as required under Section 33 of the Act was obtained and under

these circumstances a dispute has arisen which may be adjudicated as provided under Section 33A of the Act. A preliminary objection was raised by the respondents that this complaint is not covered by Section 33A of the Act as there is no industrial dispute pending before this Tribunal and as such there was no violation of the provisions of Section 33 of the Act. It was, however, admitted that the complainant for valid reasons was suspended.

2. Section 33 provides that the conditions of service of a workman are to remain unchanged under certain circumstances during the pendency of any conciliation proceedings before a conciliation officer or a board, an arbitrator or a Labour Court or Tribunal or National Tribunal in respect of an industrial dispute. Similarly, sub-section (2) of Section 33 of the Act refers to the pendency of any such proceedings in respect of an industrial dispute. It is, therefore, quite clear that unless an industrial dispute is pending, the provisions of Section 33A are not attracted. In the present case, the proceedings which had been started by the complainant for the recovery of his wages under Section 33C(2) of the Act cannot be said to be pending in respect of an industrial dispute which has been defined under Section 2(k) of the Act. Proceedings under section 33C(2) of the Act do not amount to industrial dispute and, there is string of authorities on this point. This being so, the provisions of Section 33 were not contravened which may give rise to a dispute being adjudicated under Section 33A of the Act. The preliminary objection of the respondents is, therefore, upheld, the complaint is not maintainable and is dismissed.

R. K. BAWEJA, Presiding Officer.

30th March, 1974

[No. L. 42025/3/74/LRIII]

New Delhi, the 17th April, 1974

**S.O. 1083.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Sirigao mines of Messrs Chowgule and Company Limited, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th April, 1974.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY.**

**Reference No. CGIT-2/7 of 1973**

**EMPLOYERS IN RELATION TO THE SIRIGAO MINES OF MESSRS CHOWGULE AND COMPANY PRIVATE LIMITED, MORMUGAO HARBOUR (GOA)**

**AND**

**Their Workmen**

**Present :**

Shri N. K. Vani.—Presiding Officer.

**Appearances :**

For the Employers.—Shri D. P. Sinha, Labour Officer.

For the Workmen.—Shri George Vas, General Secretary, Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union.

**Industry :** Iron Ore Mines.

**State :** Goa, Daman and Diu.

#### **AWARD**

By order No. L-29012/18/73-LRIV dated 19-7-1973, the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Sirigao mine of

Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the schedule as mentioned below :—

#### **"SCHEDULE**

**WHETHER THE ACTION OF THE MANAGEMENT OF SIRIGAO MINES OF MESSRS CHOWGULE AND COMPANY PRIVATE LIMITED, MORMUGAO HARBOUR (GOA) IN DISMISSING SHRI M. MUTHUSWAMI, EUCLID DRIVER, SIRIGAO MINES, VIDE THEIR LETTER DATED THE 15TH JULY, 1971, WAS JUSTIFIED? IF NOT, TO WHAT RELIEF IS THE WORKMAN ENTITLED?"**

2. The facts giving rise to this reference are as follows :—

(i) The workman Shri M. Muthuswami was working with Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited as Euclid Driver. He was chargesheeted for some incident alleged to have taken place in the workers colony on 10-3-1971 at about 12-20 P.M. Domestic enquiry was held against him. In that enquiry he was found guilty of all charges levelled against him. The company accepted the findings of the Enquiry Officer and dismissed him from service.

(ii) In connection with the dismissal of the employee, he raised an industrial dispute with the company asking for reinstatement. As his demand was not accepted he approached the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-de-Gama, who tried to bring about conciliation but in vain.

(iii) The Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Vasco-de-Gama submitted his failure of conciliation report dated 10th May, 1973 to the Government. On account of this the Government referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

3. On receipt of the reference notices were issued to the parties to file their written statements. In pursuance of these notices, both the parties appeared before me.

4. Messrs Chowgule & Co. Private Ltd. Mormugao Harbour, Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Company") has filed written statement at Ex. 1/E and rejoinder at Ex. 3/E (vide annexures B and C respectively attached to the Award.)

5. The General Secretary, Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union has filed written statement on behalf of the workman Shri M. Muthuswami at Ex. 2/W (vide Annexure A attached to the Award).

6. According to the General Secretary of the Union on behalf of the workman :—

(i) The standing orders cannot be made applicable to the workman as the alleged incident of misconduct took place far away from the work spot at his place of residence on a weekly day of rest on 10-3-1971.

(ii) When the private dispute resulted in an assault by one workman on another such assault may attract the relevant provisions of the Penal Code but it cannot attract disciplinary action by the employer under Industrial Law. The company cannot frame charges on the basis of the Standing Orders and hold enquiry. The company is not justified in taking the action of dismissal. The dismissal of the employee be set aside and he be reinstated in service with continuity of service and back wages.

7. According to the Company's written statement Ex.1/E:—

(i) As the cause of Shri Muthuswami has not been espoused by any workmen employed in the company the present dispute does not become an industrial dispute and hence the reference is not tenable.

(ii) If it is held that this reference is under Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947, it is still bad in law and not maintainable as Section 2A of the I.D. Act is ultra vires the Constitution of India. Section 2A of



the I.D. Act is void and illegal as it offends the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution because it confers unbridled, unguided and discriminatory powers on the Government under Section 10 of the Act. The power that the appropriate Government enjoys under Section 10 results in discrimination when applied to cases coming within the scope of Section 2A and hence Section 2A is ultra vires and unconstitutional and ought to be struck down. Hence the reference under Section 2A is bad in law.

- (iii) The workman accepted all his dues in full and final settlement of all his claims on 7-9-1971. At the time Shri Muthuswami raised the dispute, he was not workman within the meaning of Section 2(a) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and hence there is no dispute existing between the workman and the company.
  - (iv) Shri Muthuswami was employed as an Euclid Driver in the Company's Sirigao Mines. He was in the employment of the company with effect from 1-1-1958. The company has provided quarters to its employees near the mining area. He was dismissed after a fair, proper and just enquiry.
  - (v) The workman had in the past also committed similar misconduct of which lenient view was taken with a view to give him opportunity to improve his behaviour. He was on several occasions warned, censured, suspended and even transferred as punishment for his habitual quarrels, assault on fellow-employees and drunkenness and other misconducts. On most of the occasions, he pleaded guilty, apologised and promised to behave properly in future. In view of these the Director came to the conclusion that no purpose will be served by allowing the workman to continue any further in service and hence he was dismissed.
  - (vi) The workman by his letter dated 3-9-1971 addressed to the Managing Director of the company admitted his guilt but appealed to the Managing Director to take a lenient view, but the same was rejected.
  - (vii) The behaviour of the workman caused nuisance to his fellow-employees and neighbours. Time and again the breach of peace was threatened. As he showed no improvement in his behaviour, the company was constrained to dismiss him from the services.
  - (viii) Action of dismissing the workman was in accordance with the certified Standing orders of the company applicable to the workman. This Tribunal ought not to interfere with the lawful and just order of dismissal of the company. The action of the Company in dismissing the workman was proper and justified.
8. According to the company's rejoinder Ex. 3/E:—
- (i) The misconduct committed by the workman was serious and grave.
  - (ii) The incident took place outside the working hours as well as outside place of work of the concerned workman but the same was committed in the residential colony of the company, which is only two furlongs from the working place. His drunkenness, assault on fellow-employee, riotous and disorderly behaviour constitutes misconduct punishable under Standing Orders.
  - (iii) It is true that Standing Orders generally govern the behaviour of the workmen at the work-premises only but a perusal of the Standing Orders reveal that it brings within its compass the misconducts committed in the residential colony of the company. It has provided residential accommodation to the majority of its workers at Sirigao Mine. With a view to keep an healthy atmosphere it has to keep discipline at its colony too. Standing orders applied to the behaviour of the workmen on the premises and even in the residential colony of the company. It has also framed 'Occupancy Rules' which govern

the behaviour of the employees in the quarters provided to them by the company. It was justified in taking action against the worker for an assault on another workman. The order of dismissal was just as he was found guilty of the mis-behaviour.

9. The company has produced documents at Ex. 4/E to 12/F and 15/E to 22/E.

10. The workman Shri Muthuswami has examined himself on oath before me at Ex. 13/W. He has produced a letter dated 30-7-1971 at Ex. 14/W.

11. Shri D. P. Sinha, Labour Officer of the company has given pursis saying that he will rely only on documentary evidence on record and that he will not lead any oral evidence.

12. From the pleading and documents on record the following points arise for consideration in this reference.

- (i) Whether the dispute between the company and the employee Shri M. Muthuswami is an industrial dispute within the meaning of Section 2(k) read with Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947?
- (ii) Whether this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain the reference?
- (iii) Whether the domestic enquiry held against Shri M. Muthuswami is vitiated?
- (iv) Whether the action of the management of Sirigao mines of Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) in dismissing Shri M. Muthuswami, Euclid Driver, Sirigao Mine vide their letter dated the 15th July, 1971 was justified?
- (v) If not to what relief is the workman entitled?
- (vi) What order?

13. My findings are as follows:—

- (i) Yes
- (ii) Yes
- (iii) Yes
- (iv) No
- (v) Entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service but without back wages from the date of dismissal till 3-3-1974.
- (vi) As per order.

#### REASONS

##### Point Nos. 1 & 11

14. Shri D. P. Sinha, Labour Officer of the company contends that the dispute between the company and Shri M. Muthuswami is not an industrial dispute because it is a dispute between the employer and a single individual and because the same is not raised by a body of employees. In support of this contention he relies on Section 2(k) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

15. Section 2(k) of the I.D. Act, 1947 is as follows:—

"(k) 'Industrial dispute means any dispute or difference between employers and employers or between employers and workmen or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment or the terms of employment or with the conditions of labour, of any person."

16. A perusal of the above Section shows that prima facie the present dispute between the company and Shri Muthuswami is not an industrial dispute within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the I.D. Act, 1947 because it is not a dispute between the employer and a body of workmen and because it is a dispute between the employer and a single workman.

17. Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947 has been inserted by Act 35 of 1965. This Section 2A is as follows :—

**"2. A dismissal etc. of an individual workman to be deemed to be an industrial dispute.**—Where any employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with, or arising out of, such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute notwithstanding that no other workman or any union of workmen is a party to the dispute."

18. In view of the introduction of Section 2A referred to above there cannot be any doubt that the dispute between an employer and a single workman becomes an industrial dispute though no other workman or any union of workmen is a party to the dispute.

19. Shri Sinha, Labour Officer for the company contends that though the present dispute is an industrial dispute within the meaning of Section 2-A of the I.D. Act, 1947, yet the reference made to this Tribunal is bad in law because Section 2A is void and illegal, as it offends the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution. In support of this, he relies on the ruling of the Calcutta High Court in the case between Jute and Jute Goods Buffer Stock Association Vs. The Second Industrial Tribunal of West Bengal and others, reported in 1972, Lab.I.C.503. This ruling is as follows :—

"Section 2-A is void since the power of Government under Section 10 is un-principled as applied to cases of individual dispute deemed to be industrial dispute under Section 2A. AIR 1957 SC 329 and AIR 1957 SC 532 Rel. on AIR1970 Mys 171 and AIR 1970 Delhi 60 and AIR 1970 Mad 82 Distinguished. AIR 1971 Punj and Har 60 Doubtful. (para. 30).

The Supreme Court laid down criteria for the exercise of discretion under Section 10 for collective disputes do not apply to Section 10 references of individual disputes under Section 2-A because there can be no threat of interruption of production or of industrial strike or breach of industrial peace in cases of individual disputes.

Section 10 discretion of the Government is rendered unguided on account of its being free to make a reference in the case of one workman and refuse a reference in the case of another although both of them may be situated in exactly similar circumstances (para. 16).

The Act was enacted for settlement of collective disputes between employers and workmen. The enactment of Section 2A destroys the concept of an industrial dispute as a collective dispute. The provisions of Section 2-A do not fit into the general texture of the Act. (para. 18).

A right to form trade Union Association even by employers is guaranteed by Article 19(1)(c) of the Constitution. Any law which is inconsistent (as Section 2-A is) with that fundamental right is to that extent rendered void by Article 13. Thus so far as collective disputes are concerned the powers under Section 10 are valid; but those powers are invalid in relation to an industrial dispute deemed to be an industrial dispute within Section 2-A. Consequently Section 2-A which is severable from Section 10 is void and as such inoperative in law, in spite of Section 10 being valid for collective disputes being referred to adjudication under Section 10. (Para. 18)."

20. The above mentioned ruling supports the contention of Shri Sinha that Section 2A of the I.D. Act, 1947 is void and bad in law as it offends the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution. There is however, the ruling of High Court of Mysore in the case between P. Janardhana Shetty and Union of India and others, reported in 1970, II, LLJ, page 738, which has taken a contrary view. This ruling is as follows :—

"In the instant case the employees whose services were terminated preferred appeals to the Commissioner of Labour under S.39 of the Mysore Shops and Establishment Act. After S.2A of the Industrial disputes act, 1947 came into force on 1-12-1965 the Labour Commissioner directed the employees to have recourse to the remedy provided under the Industrial Disputes Act.

The employees filed petition before the Commissioner for Labour withdrawing the appeals, pursuant to which the Commissioner for Labour directed the Labour Officer to conciliate the dispute relating to such employees termination. The Labour Officer consequently initiated conciliation proceedings by issuing notices to the employer and the employee. In the instant writ petition preferred by the employee against such notices issued by the Conciliation Officer, it was contended on his behalf that S.24 should be struck down as being violative of Art 14 of the Constitution of India and its enactment was beyond the powers of the legislature. It was further contended that as the dispute relating to discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination having taken place in the instance case prior to 1-12-1965 S 2A had no application and the Commissioner of Labour had no jurisdiction to direct the Labour Officer to conciliate the dispute and the Labour Commissioner should have disposed of the appeals under S.39 of the Shops and Establishments Act.

Negating the contention that S. 2A was ultra vires of the Act and it was violative of Art.14 of the Constitution of India, it was held that S.2A could not be said to be inconsistent and repugnant to the object of the Act. When a subsequent Act amends the earlier Act in such a way as to incorporate itself or as part of itself, into the earlier Act, then the earlier Act must thereafter be read and construed as if the altered words had been written into the earlier Act with pen and the old words scored out so that thereafter there is no need to refer the amending Act at all. The words 'industrial dispute' occurring in the preamble of the Act, are wide enough to cover dispute between an employer and single employee and as such individual dispute relating to discharge, dismissal or retrenchment could not be construed to be outside the scope of the Industrial Disputes Act, as the legislature was competent to introduce S.2A under Entry 22 in list III to Schedule 7 of the Constitution of India. The said entry is wide enough to include industrial and labour disputes between an individual employee and his employer.

It was further held that the said S.2A did not offend, Art. 14 of the Constitution of India, as there is an intelligible differentia which distinguishes an individual workman who is discharged, dismissed, retrenched or whose services have been terminated and individual workman who has some other grievance in regard to his employment or conditions his employment or conditions thereof, and as the discharge, dismissal or retrenchment or termination of service of a workman is of graver consequence to a workman than any other grievance in regard to other terms or conditions of employment. By enabling the individual workman to raise a dispute in regard to his discharge, dismissal or retrenchment, his cause need not bank upon the support of fellow workers as it was prior to the coming into force of S.2A and thus the object for which S.2A was introduced has been achieved. So long as discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination of service is of greater degree of grievance consequence to an individual workman than any other grievance in regard to his employment or conditions thereof, it is open to the Legislature to provide for a special remedy in regard to a workman who is discharged, dismissed, retrenched or whose services are terminated, while such remedy may not be provided for a workman whose grievance is of lesser gravity."

21. In the present case Shri Sinha has not pointed out any ruling of the Bombay High Court or of Supreme Court in support of his contention that Section 2A is void and illegal as it offends the provision of Article 14 of the Constitution. In the absence of specific ruling by the Supreme Court or by the Bombay High Court, I rely on the ruling of the High Court of Mysore, which has taken a view that Section 2-A is not void. If Section 2-A is not void and illegal the dispute raised by Shri Muthuswami would be deemed to be an industrial dispute though it is not espoused by other workmen or any union of workmen. Hence the Central Government was competent to refer this dispute to this Tribunal and this Tribunal has got jurisdiction to entertain this reference.

22. Shri Sinha for the Company contends that when Shri Muthuswami raised the industrial dispute he was not a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 and that on account of this there is no dispute existing between the workman and the company. This contention is misconceived.

23. Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, is as follows :—

“‘workman’ means any persons (including an apprentice) employed in any industry to do any skilled or unskilled manual supervisory, technical or clerical work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied and for the purpose of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with or as a consequence of that dispute or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute.....”

24. It is not contended on behalf of the company that Shri Muthuswami was never in their service. The company clearly admits that Shri Muthuswami was employed as a Euclid Driver in the Company's Sirigao Mines and that he was in the employment of the company with effect from 1-1-1958. The company held domestic enquiry against Shri Muthuswami and dismissed him. The workman is challenging this dismissal and claiming reinstatement.

25. The definition of Section 2(s) given above clearly shows that a workman within the meaning of section 2(s) includes any person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with or as a consequence of that dispute or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute. As Shri Muthuswami has been dismissed by the company, it cannot be said that he was not a workman of the company within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 at the time when he raised the dispute. Hence the contention raised by the company in this respect fails.

26. It appears that Shri Muthuswami has accepted Rs. 165.60 from the company under receipt dated 7-9-1971 produced at Ex. 4/E, stating as follows :—

“I, Muthuswami, B. Driver hereby accept the above amount in full and final settlement of my account I declare that I have no other claims whatsoever against the Company in connection with my employment with them and subsequent termination of my appointment.”

27. Shri Sinha Labour Officer for the company contends that as Shri Muthuswami accepted all his dues in full and final settlement of his claim on 7-9-1971, he cannot now raise an industrial dispute regarding his dismissal and claim reinstatement with continuity of service with back wages. This contention cannot be accepted.

28. Ex. 4/E is a formal receipt containing printed matters. As Shri Muthuswami was dismissed from service and as he was without job it may be that he might have accepted whatever amount was given to him. If his dismissal is illegal according to law he cannot be stopped from challenging the dismissal and claiming consequential benefits. In my opinion there cannot be any such estoppel in case of illegal dismissal, if there be any.

29. In short it will be clear from the above discussions that this Tribunal has jurisdiction to entertain this reference and the Government was competent to refer this dispute to this Tribunal. Hence my findings on point No. I and II are as above.

**Point No. III**

30. In connection with the incident, which took place on 10-3-1971 at 12.20 P.M. at the residence of Shri K. P. Salgaonkar Mechanic, in the company's colony, the workman Shri Muthuswami was chargesheeted and domestic enquiry was held against him.

31. The chargesheet issued to Shri Muthuswami on 7/14-4-1971 produced at Ex. 5/E is as follows :—

“It has been reported that on 10th March, 1971 at about 12.20 p.m. you went to the residence of Shri K. P. Salgaonkar, Mechanic in the Company's Colony and waged a quarrel, assaulted him and torn his garments and had to be separated by fellow-employees, the neighbours.

After a lapse of a few minutes you again went to Shri Salgaonkar's place with sword in your hand, broke open the front door and tried to assault him and that he had to run for safety to the Office Manager's residence. You were in fully drunken condition then. You were, therefore, taken to the Sirigao Mine's office for preliminary investigation as to what had happened; but you refused to say anything in the matter. You were, therefore, called for preliminary investigation in the Office the next day by 2.30 p.m.; but did not see the Manager until 13th March 71. This misbehaviour on your part affects discipline among the employees and the smooth-functioning of the Establishment adversely. You are, therefore, hereby charged with the following acts of misconduct :—

- (i) Drunkenness, riotous, disorderly or indecent behaviour in the Company's premises and an act subversive of discipline;
- (ii) Improper behaviour such as quarrelling with fellow-employee and assaulting him in the Company's premises;
- (iii) Wilful disregard or disobedience of orders (wilful refusal to reply to queries and failure to report to the Mines Manager) for preliminary investigation; and
- (iv) Incivility to a co-worker by entering into his private room forcibly and intimidating him.

The above stated misconduct is considered wilful in the circumstances of your case; because for similar misconduct disciplinary punishments were imposed on you in the past.

A formal departmental enquiry in the matter will be conducted by Mr. N. N. Aswath Narayan of S.B.D., Sirigao Yard in the Sirigao Mines Office on a date an dtime to be intimated to you by him when evidence against you will be recorded in your presence and you will be given chance to cross-examine the departmental witnesses and later to put your own defence evidence and witnesses if any. You are hereby directed to appear for the enquiry as may be scheduled with your written explanation to the charges, if any, directly before the Enquiry Officer. If you fail to do so, the enquiry may be conducted ex-parte.”

32. It appears that the enquiry was conducted on 17-6-1971 in Sirigao Mine Office. During the enquiry Shri Muthuswami was present. He has taken part in the enquiry and examined witnesses.

33. Original enquiry papers are produced at Ex. 5/E and 6/E.

34. The enquiry officer submitted his finding, holding Shri Muthuswami guilty of the charges levelled against him.

35. The Director after giving Shri Muthuswami opportunity for showing cause as to why he should not be dismissed, and considering his explanation dismissed him from service by his letter dated 12/15-7-1971 Ex. 9/E.

36. It is contended on behalf of Shri Muthuswami that the Standing orders of the company Ex. 12/E do not apply to the behaviour of Shri Muthuswami in company's colony far away from the mining establishment and place of work and that on account of this domestic enquiry held against him on the basis of the Standing Orders is vitiated.

37. The company in its rejoinder Ex. 3/E para. 11 contends that it is true that Standing Orders generally govern the behaviour of the workmen at the work-premises only but a perusal of Standing Orders reveal that it brings within its compass the misconducts committed in the residential colony of the company.

38. The heading of the Standing Orders of the company produced at Ex. 12/E shows that they are in respect of Sirigao Iron Ore, Mines, Costi Iron Ore Mines, Pale Iron Ore Mines and Sacorda Iron Ore Mines of M/s Chowgule & Company (Pvt.) Ltd., Goa. This heading shows that the Standing Orders apply to mines and not to the residential quarters far away from the place of work.

39. The company has produced rules, regulating allotment and occupation of residential quarters at Annexure B to the rejoinder Ex. 3/E. Rule 29(iii) of Annexure B to the rejoinder Ex. 3/E is as follows :—

"The management may, at any time, cancel the allotment of the quarters if the occupant thereof is found guilty of a breach of any of the Occupancy Rules."

40. This shows that if the employee occupying the company's quarters commits any breach of occupancy rules his allotment can be cancelled.

41. In the Standing orders Ex. 12/E, non-observance of rules governing the Company quarters is treated as misconduct within the meaning of clause 18(1)(1). Habitual non-observance of rules governing the company's quarters is a misconduct within the meaning of clause 18(2)(1) of the Standing Orders. In the present case there is no charge either under clause 18(1)(1) or under clause 18(2)(1) against the employee during the domestic enquiry.

42. Charge No. 1 in the charge sheet referred to above regarding Drunkenness, riotous, disorderly or indecent behaviour in the Company's premises and an act subversive of discipline cannot be said to be covered under Standing Order clause 18(2)(i).

43. Clause 18(2)(i) of the Standing Orders Ex. 12/E is as follows :—

"Drunkenness or riotous, disorderly or indecent behaviour in the department or section or any act subversive or discipline."

44. A reading of the above provisions of the Standing Orders clearly shows that Drunkenness or riotous, disorderly or indecent behaviour on the part of Shri Muthuswami in company's colony situated at Poirra Village far away from the mines or the place of work would not fall under clause 18(2)(1) of the Standing Orders because the alleged misconduct has not taken place in the department or section of the company.

45. As regards charge No. 11 in Ex. 5/E, it does not also fall under clause 18(2)(q) as the alleged misconduct of Shri Muthuswami is in the company's quarters meant for the company's employees far away from the work place.

46. As the Standing Orders do not apply to the behaviour of Shri Muthuswami in the residential colony in question far away from the place of work, the domestic enquiry held against him in respect of the two major charges under clauses 18(2)(i) and 18(2)(q) of the Standing Orders is vitiated. There should not have been any enquiry and charges in respect of these two charges against Shri Muthuswami under the Standing Orders.

47. Shri Sinha, Labour Officer for the company relies on 1961, I, I.L.J., page 546 in the case between Central India Coalfields Ltd., Calcutta and Ram Bilas Shobnath to show that the action of the company in dismissing Shri Muthuswami for the misconduct committed outside the worksite and beyond the working hours is justified.

48. This case lays down as follows :—

"The standing orders of a concern *inter alia* provided that drunkenness, fighting, riotous or disorderly or indecent behaviour would constitute misconduct entailing dismissal.

The workers were staying in the quarters provided by the company. Such quarters were situated very near the workspot. A workman was found guilty of being drunk and of ready and indecent behaviour towards his co-workers and the members of their families. The misconduct was committed outside the workspot and beyond the working hours. He was dismissed from service and the employer filed an application under S. 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, for approval of their action.

The industrial tribunal refused to grant approval on ground that the misconduct was committed beyond the working hours outside the workspot.

Allowing the appeal by special leave preferred by the employer against the decision of the industrial tribunal, held :

Normally the Standing Orders would apply to the behaviour on the premises where the workmen discharge their duties and during the hours of their work. It may also be conceded that if a quarrel takes place between workmen outside the working hours and away from the workspot, that would be a private matter which may not fall within the provisions of such Standing Order. But in the special circumstances of the instant case it is clear that the incident took place in the quarters at a short distance from the workspot. Hence the action of the employer in dismissing such a workman must be held perfectly justified. It was further proved that unless the employer took some action against the concerned workman breach of peace among the workmen was threatened. The employer could not consider such matter with complience.

Further it could not be contended that the industrial tribunal was right in refusing to grant approval because the dismissal was an unduly severe punishment in the instant case. In an enquiry under S. 33(2)(b) normally it is not open to the industrial tribunal to consider whether the sentence proposed is unduly severe or not. Such a consideration might be relevant in dealing with an industrial dispute. Apart from that, on the merits it must be held that the punishment of dismissal was not severe."

49. From the above facts it will be clear that the Standing Orders of that company provided that drunkenness, fighting riotous or disorderly or indecent behaviour would be a misconduct entailing dismissal.

50. In the present case, which I am deciding the Standing Orders Ex. 12/E provide that drunkenness or riotous, disorderly or indecent behaviour in the department or section or any act subversive of discipline amounts to misconduct. It is clear that the Standing Orders of this company specifically mentions that the drunkenness, or riotous, disorderly or indecent behaviour should be in the department or section and not anywhere.

51. In the ruling relied upon by Shri Sinha and referred to above, the quarters meant for the workmen were situated from the coal bearing area at a distance of about 200 feet from the pit-mouth. In the case which I am deciding the quarters provided for the employees are situated at Poirra village far away from the place of work. It is at a distance of about 20 minutes walk. It cannot be therefore said that they are adjacent to the place of work.

52. In the case relied upon by Shri Sinha and referred to above breach of peace among the workmen was threatened. In the present case which I am deciding the dispute was between Shri Muthuswami and Shri Salgaonkar on account of quarrel over children. The dispute between them was purely a private affair. It had no concern with the other employees of the company staying in the colony. There was no danger of breach of peace among the employees. Hence I am of the view that the ruling relied upon by Shri Sinha does not apply to the facts of the present case which I am deciding.

53. Shri George Vaz on behalf of the workman relies on the ruling reported in 1964, U. LLJ, page 113 in the case between Tata Oil Mills Company and its workmen to show that the alleged action of Shri Muthuswami is not covered by the Standing Orders of the company produced at Ex. 12/F because the quarrel between Shri Muthuswami and Shri Salgaonkar was a private quarrel which took place outside the company's working place and during the rest day.

54. The ruling reported in 1964, II, LLJ, page 113 lays down as follows:—

"The relevant Standing Orders *inter alia* provided that drunkenness fighting, riotous or disorderly behaviour or indecent behaviour within or without the factory would be misconduct. A workman was found to have assaulted outside the factory another workman as the latter was in favour of introduction of incentive bonus scheme, which was opposed by the former and his colleagues. The Industrial Tribunal held that the action of the concerned workman was not covered by the relevant Standing Orders as it was a private quarrel between the two workmen which took place outside the factory.

In the instant appeal by special leave preferred by the employer it was held that if the disorderly or riotous behaviour had some rational connection with the employment of the assailant and the victim, such act would fall to be covered by the Standing Order. It would be unreasonable to include within such Standing Order any riotous behaviour outside the factory which was the result of purely private and individual dispute and in course of which tempers of both the contestants became hot. However, in the instant case, the assault was not the result of a purely individual or private quarrel between the assailant and his victim, but it was referable to the difference of opinion between the two in regard to the introduction of the incentive bonus scheme on which the two rival groups of workmen in the establishment were sharply divided. Hence the conduct of the concerned workman in assaulting the other workman surely for the reason that the latter was supporting the plea for more production, could not be said to be outside the purview of the relevant Standing Order."

55. A perusal of this ruling shows that this ruling lays down the same principle as laid down in the ruling reported in 1961, I, LLJ, page 546.

56. As regards charges 3 and 4 mentioned in Ex. 5/E they fall under clause 15(1)(a) and (c) of the standing orders. Punishment provided for these clauses in the standing orders is warning, censure or fine upto 2 per cent of his wages in a month. In the present case the workman has been dismissed on the basis of the enquiry referred to above, which is vitiated.

#### Point Nos. iv and v :

57. It is contended on behalf of Shri Muthuswami that the action of the management of Sirigao mines of Messrs Chougule and Company Private Limited in dismissing Shri M. Muthuswami, Euclid Driver, Sirigao Mine vide their letter dated 15-7-1971 is not justified and that he should be reinstated with continuity of service and back wages. As the enquiry held against Shri Muthuswami is vitiated his dismissal on the basis of the charges levelled against him cannot be sustained.

58. The workman Shri Muthuswami, Ex. 13/W says before me that in his absence Shri Krishna Balgaonkar's son Banu had injured his daughter Sashikala with blade. After he came to know about this incident after his returning home, he went to Shri Krishna Salgaonkar and asked him about the incident. As that time there was exchange of hot words between them. Shri Krishna Salgaonkar held his shirt and tore it and the neighbours intervened and separated them.

59. It appears that the dispute arose on account of quarrel over children, that this dispute was purely a private dispute and that it was for Shri Krishna Salgaonkar to take action against Shri Muthuswami by filing a criminal complaint. The company should not have interfered with their private affairs. I am therefore of the view that the dismissal of Shri Muthuswami should be set aside and that he should be reinstated in service with continuity of service.

60. It appears from the documentary evidence on record that Shri Muthuswami had committed several lapses in the past and that he was given warning and censure. Even on the day of incident in question Shri Muthuswami admits in his appeal dated 3-9-71 Ex. 10/E that he was under the influence of alcohol. Taking this fact into consideration and the previous records, I am of the view that Shri Muthuswami should not be allowed back wages and that he should be reinstated as he has put in more than 21 years of service in the company. Hence my finding on point Nos. 4 and 5 are as above.

#### Point No. vi :

61. For the reasons given above, I pass the following order:—

#### ORDER

(i) It is hereby declared that the action of the management of Sirigao Mines of Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour (Goa) in dismissing Shri Muthuswami, Euclid Driver, Sirigao Mines, vide their letter dated the 15th July, 1971, was not justified and that he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service but without back wages from the date of dismissal till today i.e. 3-3-1974.

(ii) Award is made accordingly.

(iii) No order as to costs.

N. K. VANI, Presiding Officer

#### ANNEXURE 'A'

BEFORE SHRI N. K. VANI, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
NO. 2 AT BOMBAY.

Reference : CGIT—2/7 of 1973

#### BETWEEN

Employer in relation to M/s. Chowgule & Co. Pvt. Ltd.

#### AND

Their Workmen—M. Muthuswami.

In the matter of termination of service and demand for reinstatement.

#### Statement of Claims

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS FILED BY THE GOA MINING  
LABOUR WFTFARE UNION ON BEHALF OF THE  
WORKMAN—M. MUTHUSWAMI

MAY IT PLEASE THE HONOURABLE TRIBUNAL :

1 The Government of India by its ORDER of the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment No 1-29022/18/73-LRIV dated the 12th July 1973 has been pleased to make a reference of the following dispute to this Honourable Tribunal for adjudication :

## SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Sirigao Mines of Messrs Chowgule And Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour (GOA) in dismissing Shri M. Muthuswami, Euclid Driver, Sirigao mines vide their letter dated 15th July 1971 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. Messrs Chowgule & Company Pvt. Ltd is a private limited company incorporated in India under the Indian Companies Act. The Company is engaged in Iron Ore business and is the leading firm in the Iron Ore Industry and is number one exporter of Iron ore to Japan and other foreign countries. It has iron ore mines at Sirigao, Pale, Costi and other areas in Goa and also at Hospet at Mysore State. Besides direct extraction of Iron Ore. It is the only Company which owns a Pallestising Plant at Pale and A Ship Building Division at Sirigao which are allied industries connected with the Iron Ore Industry.

3. The Service Conditions of all employees are covered by Certified Standing Orders as certified on the 30th January 1964 for employees in the Iron Ore Mines at Sirigao, Costi, Pale and Sacorda. This Honourable Tribunal should ask the Company to file a Certified Copy of their Standing Orders.

4. Shri M. Muthuswami, the workman concerned in this dispute has put in a continuous service of 21 years with the Company and has a previous service of five years as a temporary workman. He has thus been engaged by the company for a total service of 26 years before he was terminated by letter dated 12th/15th July 1971 as referred to in the Schedule to this reference. The original of this letter will be produced during the hearing. A copy of the letter is enclosed as Annexure I.

5. A perusal of the letter of termination—conclusion stated:

"In conclusion, I feel that there are no mitigating circumstances in your favour to merit any lenient consideration this time. I, therefore hereby order you stand dismissed from service without notice or compensation in lieu with effect from the date of receipt by you of this order. This has to be done to maintain strict discipline and employee—relations at the work place."

6. It is the contention of the Union that the Order of Dismissal is not merited under the Company Standing Orders and the Director in issuing this order of dismissal has surpassed his powers as granted to him under the Standing Orders and therefore this order of dismissal is illegal, null and void.

7. To prove our contention it is necessary to go into the whole background of the chargesheet and the time, date and place of the incident for which the workman was charge-sheeted and examine whether this incident even if proved merited a dismissal from service.

8. The workman was chargesheeted by letter dated 7th/14th April, 1971 for an incident of alleged drunkenness and assault that took place on the 10th March, 1971 and which took place between two workmen and which was a projection of the quarrel between the children of the two workmen. The incident took place at Poirra village which is far away from the place of work and the mining establishment of the Company. The incident also took place when the workmen were not on Duty and at the place of residence on a Weekly day of rest the 10th March, 1971. It must be observed that the Company has built residential barracks and quarters at Poirra village for the convenience of their workmen. That workmen are staying at these quarters with their wives and families and it will be far-fetched to say that this Poirra village is a work place.

9. The Standing Orders as Certified were framed in order to maintain good discipline of workmen at their work place and it would be correct to say that the workers are governed by these Standing Orders during their working hours at their place of work in the mines and mining establishments. Poirra village is outside the mining area and workplace.

10. It is our contention that the Standing Orders cannot cover the workers at their place of residence even if this place of residence is provided as a workers colony for the benefit of workers employed in the Company, a worker cannot be said to be governed by the Standing Orders for 24 hours of his life all days of the month and year.

11. If we further study the charges made out against the workman and study them in context with the Company Standing Orders it will be seen that they apply only to the work place of the workman and not to his place of residence. The charges do not specify the exact reference to the Standing Orders. Charge No. 1 will correspond to S.O.No.19(2)(i); No. 2 to S.O. No. 19 (2) (g); No. 3 to S.O. No. 19(1)(a) and No. 4 to S.O. 19(1)(e). Charge Nos. 3 and 4 as per the Standing Orders only merit a warning, censure or fine up to 2 per cent. Charge Nos. 1 and 2 would merit suspension for four days at a time, with-holding increment or promotion, or demotion or reduction in grade or removal or dismissal from service if he is found guilty of misconduct. It is the contention of the Union that those Standing Orders cannot be made applicable to the workman as all the allegations of misconduct took place far away from the place of work.

12. There are case laws to show that the penalty of dismissal is not merited even if there is an assault of one workman on another which is purely of a private nature and which took place outside the factory premises and after the working hours. The employer is not justified to take action against the workman. It has been held that when a private dispute resulted in an assault by one workman on another such assault may attract the relevant provisions of the Penal Code but it cannot attract disciplinary action by the employer under Industrial Law.

13. It is thus not necessary for us to go into the merits of Charges and the enquiry, and find out whether these charges have been proved by the Enquiry held by the Enquiry Officer appointed by the Company. The Company could not frame charges on the basis of the Company Standing Orders neither could they hold any enquiry on the basis of the Company Standing Orders. Neither was the Company justified in taking action on the basis of the Company Standing Orders or order the dismissal of the workman. The Director was not empowered with any such powers under the Standing Orders.

14. If the allegations and incident as reported to have making place had at all taken place on the 10th March, 1971, the Company would have been justified in filing a police complaint and at the most grant the penalty of ejection from the Company quarters and colony which would have suited an act of misconduct committed in a workers colony. The penalty to be faced by a workman staying in Company quarters for an act of misconduct would be ejection and removal from the Company colony and this would be sufficient penalty for the workman for his act of misconduct and violation of good behaviour.

15. There is no misconduct at the workman's place of work and no charge of mis-behaviour, drunkenness or or assault and his work place or at the time of his duty in the mine, and still the Director in the order of dismissal dated 15th July 1971 has stated that he has given his order of dismissal because "This has to be done to maintain strict discipline and employer relations at the work place". Obviously the Director has not applied his mind to the nature of the charges and the time, place and date of the incident. The whole, incident has taken place on the workers day of rest and weekly off, it has taken place far away from the place of work at the workers colony at Poirra village. The mines are situated at Sirigao some two miles away.

16. The Director should also have realised that in Goa it is not an offence to drink liquor after the working hours. That most workers in Goa drink with their evening meal and therefore it was not extra ordinary if the workman Muthuswamy had admitted that he had taken a little drink and that too on his weekly day of rest when there is no work on the mine. Goa after all is considered as having broken the world record on per capita consumption of alcohol we do not know whether this observation is correct because most of the alcohol manufactured in Goa is smuggled outside Goa.

There is no prohibition in Goa and Maharashtra has marked with Goa on the question of Prohibition of Alcoholic drinks. Considering that there is so much liberalist on the consumption of alcohol it should not be held against the workman Muthuswami for having admitted having taken a drink. There is after all a difference between taking a drink and being drunk. For our purpose in this reference it is immaterial whether he had only had a drink or he was drunk because he was not on duty and far away from his work place, being off duty.

17. It is the case of the workman that even if he is found guilty of the allegations and charges as framed that took place on the 10th March, 1971 at Poiria Village the company had no right to dismiss him from service because no misconduct is reported at his work place and during the working hours. He has a good service of 21 years as a permanent worker of the company and a further service of 5 years as a temporary workman. That the penalty of dismissal and removal from service is illegal, null and void and not in keeping with the Company's Standing Orders. That the order of dismissal is in fact a death warrant against him and his family who were left stranded without a job for their breadwinner and without shelter from rain and sun because with the order of dismissal he was also ejected from his quarters.

18. The order of dismissal which has not been merited under the Standing Orders smacks of vindictiveness and violates fair play and humane considerations. The workman also made a last desperate attempt and appealed to the good sense of the Managing Director in his letter dated 3rd September, 1971 wherein he has stated:

"As I am now starving and desperate, I am making this final appeal to you in terms of our Company's Standing Orders. Considering all the above facts I hope you will be kind enough to relieve my distress and permit me to continue to serve you as I have been doing for the last 21 years. I shall continue to remain loyal to you. If you feel it necessary. I am prepared to execute a Bond of good behaviour in any manner that you may specify."

The workman had thus given a proper way out for the Director because even if a Chapter Case was filed against the workman by the Company before a Magistrate. The maximum that Magistrate would have taken would be a Bond of Good behaviour or a forfeiture of the Bond. The workman was prepared to hand himself over in bondage to the Director but the Director turned down this offer and has persisted in his illegal act of dismissal of the workman.

19. Justice demands that the workman Shri M. Muthuswami be reinstated in service with full back wages as the Company had no right to deprive the workman and his family his bread. The maximum that the Company could demand was a bond of good behaviour and this the workman has voluntarily offered.

20. We therefore pray that the Order of dismissal be set aside and that the workman be allowed to continue his service at Sirigao Mines as a Euclid Driver which work he has been doing for the last 21 years and more, and that he be compensated for the long period unemployment and starvation which has been imposed upon him without legal sanction, by being granted full back wages and continuity of service from the date of his illegal dismissal—the 15th July, 1971.

21. This Honourable Tribunal in the Order of Reference has been specifically called upon to adjudicate on the order of dismissal and the letter of dismissal dated the 15th July, 1973. The Director has admittedly erred when he stated that he has taken the decision to dismiss because 'this has to be done to maintain strict discipline and employee—relations at the WORK PLACE.' He has acted in good faith without probably knowing that the alleged misconduct had taken place far from the 'work place' and on a weekly day of rest. It was necessary that his subordinate officers should have given a correct appraisal of the Standing Orders to the Director.

22. The Union, therefore prays that this Honourable Tribunal should be pleased to reinstate the workman in his post retrospectively, with full back wages and compensation for the loss and mental anguish that he with his family has suffered.

23. The Union craves leave to add to and amend and/or alter this Statement of Claims if and when found necessary. The Union also craves leave to file a rejoinder to the written statement as submitted by the employer Company.

Assonopa: dated this 23rd day of November, 1973.

Sd/-

GEORGE VAZ, General Secy.

#### VERIFICATION

I, George Vaz, General Secretary of the Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union to hereby state on solemn affirmation that what is stated herein is true to the best of my information and belief.

Sd/-

Assonopa: 23-11-1973.

#### ANNEXURE 'B'

Ex. 1/E

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY.

Reference No. CGIT-2/7 of 1973

BETWEEN

Chowgule and Co. Private Ltd., Goa.

AND

Their Workmen

Written Statement of Chowgule and Company Private Ltd., (hereinafter referred to as "the Company").

1. The Company respectfully submits that the cause of Mr. Muthuswami has not been espoused by any workmen employed in the Company and has not attained the colour of an industrial dispute and, therefore, no industrial dispute exists and the reference ought to be rejected on that ground alone.

2. Without prejudice to what is stated hereinabove in the event of this Hon'ble Tribunal coming to the conclusion that the reference has been made under Section 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as "The Act") (it is submitted that there is no case for this Hon'ble Tribunal arriving at the said conclusion), then the reference is bad in law and not maintainable as it is the submission of the Company that Section 2A of the Act is *ultra vires* the Constitution of India.

3. The Company submits that Section 2A of the Act is void and illegal as it offends the provisions of Article 14 of the Constitution in that it confers unbridled, unguided and discriminatory powers on the Government under Section 10 of the Act. The Company submits that the power that the appropriate Government enjoys under Section 10 results in discrimination when applied to cases coming within the scope of Section 2A. In the circumstances, the Company submits that the Section 2A. is *ultra vires* and unconstitutional and ought to be struck down. It is, therefore, submitted that the reference under Section 2A is bad in law.

4. The Company further submits that the workman accepted all his dues in full and final settlement of his all claims on 7th September 1971 (Annex-I). It is our submission that at the time Mr. Muthuswami raised the dispute, he was not a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is, therefore, submitted that there is no dispute existing between the workman and the company and the reference ought to be rejected on that ground alone.

5. Mr. Muthuswami was employed as a Euclid Driver in the Company's Sirigao Mines. He was in the employment of the Company with effect from 1st January 1958. The Company has provided quarters to its employees near the mining area. The facts relating to the submission of the



Company that Mr. Muthuswami (hereinafter referred to as the workman) was dismissed after fair, proper and just enquiry are as follows:—

On 10th March 1971, at about 12.20 P.M. Mr. Muthuswami went to the quarters of Mr. K. P. Salgaonkar, a co-worker in the Company's residential colony, in fully drunken and intoxicate state. He waged a quarrel with Mr. Salgaonkar and assaulted and abused him and tore his clothes. The fellow-employees and neighbours, then gathered near the scene, intervened and separated him from Mr. Salgaonkar. Mr. Salgaonkar then went inside his house and closed the door from inside. Mr. Muthuswami went back but returned after some time with a weapon in his hand. He then entered the room forcibly and tried to assault Mr. Salgaonkar who had to escape for safety to the residence of Office Manager. Consequently, the workman was chargesheeted in accordance with the Standing Orders. The departmental enquiry was held on 17th June 1971, the evidence against him was recorded in his presence. The workman participated fully in the enquiry. He cross-examined departmental witnesses, put up his own defence and produced witnesses on his behalf before the Enquiry Officer.

During the course of the departmental enquiry, the workman himself admitted that he was in drunken condition at the time incident took place. Even his own witnesses, Messrs. Shaikh Jamal and Hemedios stated that the quarrel did take place and they helped in separating Mr. Muthuswami from Mr. Salgaonkar.

The Director after considering the chargesheet, records of the proceedings of the enquiry. The enquiry Officer's report, explanation dated 10-7-71 of the workman to the final show-cause notice (collectively marked as Annexure-II) dismissed the workman from services without notice or compensation in lieu of notice vide his letter dated 12th/15th July, 1971 (Annexure-III).

6. The Company further submits that the workman had in the past also committed similar misconduct of which lenient view was taken with a view to give him opportunity to improve his behaviour. He was on several occasions warned, censured, suspended and even transferred as punishment for his habitual quarrels, assault on fellow-employees and drunkenness and other misconducts. On most of the occasions, he pleaded guilty, apologised and promised to behave properly in future. In view of the above, the Director came to the conclusion that no purpose will be served by allowing the workman to continue any further in service and hence he was dismissed.

7. The Company further submits that the workman, vide his letter dated 3-9-1971, addressed to the Managing Director of the Company (Annexure-IV) admitted his guilt but appealed to the Managing Director to take a lenient view; but the same was rejected.

8. The Company submits that the behaviour of the workman caused nuisance to his fellow-employees and neighbours. Time and again the breach of peace was threatened. As he showed no improvement in his behaviour, the Company was constrained to dismiss him from the services.

9. The Company submits that its action of dismissing the workman was in accordance with the certified standing orders of the Company applicable to the workman and, therefore, this Hon'ble Tribunal ought not to interfere with the lawful and just order of dismissal of the Company.

10. The Company prays that the action of the Company in dismissing the workman being justified and proper the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to set aside the reference in question.

11. The Company respectfully submits that this Hon'ble Tribunal be pleased to try the aforesaid preliminary points raised in paragraphs 1 to 4 as preliminary issues as they go to the root of the matter and are capable of disposing of the matter if held in favour of the Company. The Company also

craves leave of this Hon'ble Tribunal to add to, alter or amend the aforesaid grounds as and when necessary.

Dated this 14th day of August 1973.

per pro CHOWGULE & CO. PRIVATE LTD.  
Sd/-

I, Padebettu Bhagavath Raghupathi Rao, the General Manager of Chowgule and Co. Private Ltd. do hereby declare that what is stated in the above written statement is true to my knowledge, information and belief.

Signed and verified by me at Mormugao Harbour aforesaid this 14th day of August, 1973.

Sd/-

ANNEXURE 'C'

Ex. 3/E  
1 2

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY.

Reference No. CGIT-2/7 of 1973

BETWEEN

Chowgule and Co. Private Limited, Goa

AND

Their Workmen

Rejoinder of Chowgule and Co. Private Limited (hereinafter referred to as "The Company") to the statement dated 23rd November, 1973 filed by Mr. George Vaz, General Secretary, Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union on behalf of Mr. Muthuswami, the workman concerned.

2. The company reiterates what is stated in its written statement dated 14th August, 1973 and denies each and every statement and submission made in the statement of Mr. Vaz in so far as they are contrary to or inconsistent with what is stated in the written statement of the Company as if the same was specifically set out herein and traversed.

3. The Company will now deal with the statement dated 23rd November, 1973.

4. With reference to paragraph 2 of the statement, the Company submits that the statements made in the said paragraph is true.

5. With reference to paragraph 3 of the statement, it is true that the service conditions of mining employees are covered by the Standing Orders certified on 27th February 1965. Here annexed and marked Annexure 'A' is a copy of the said certified Standing Orders.

6. With reference to paragraph 4 of the statement, it is denied that Mr. M. Muthuswami has put in a total service of 26 years with the Company it is denied that he has served continuously for 21 years, and 5 years as a temporary workman.

It is submitted that Mr. Muthuswami had put in total 13 1/2 years service with the Company as on 15th July, 1971.

7. With reference to paragraph 5 of the statement, the statement made therein is substantially correct.

8. With reference to paragraph 6 of the statement, it is denied that the order was not merited under the certified Standing Orders and the Director has surpassed his power. It is the submission of the Company that under the circumstances of this case as enumerated in para 5 of our written statement dated 14th August, 1973, the Director was well within his power in dismissing Mr. Muthuswami from services. Hence the Company reiterates that the dismissal order issued to Mr. Muthuswami for the misconduct committed by him entails the said punishment under the Standing Orders of the Company.

9. With reference to paragraph 7 of the statement, the Company submits that the misconduct committed by the workman concerned was serious and grave and, therefore, merited dismissal.



10. With reference to paragraph 8 of the statement, it is submitted that the incident took place outside the working hours as well as outside place of work of the concerned worker but the same was committed in the residential colony of the Company, which is only two furlongs from the working place. It is the submission of the Company that drunkenness, assault on fellow-employee, riotous and disorderly behaviour constitutes misconduct punishable under the Standing Orders.

11. With reference to paragraphs 9, 10 and 11 of the statement, it is true that Standing Orders generally govern the behaviour of the workmen at the work-premises only but a perusal of our Standing Orders reveal that it brings within its compass the misconducts committed in the residential colony of the Company. The Company further submits that it has provided residential accommodation to the majority of its workers at Sirigao Mines and with a view to keep an healthy atmosphere, the Management has to keep discipline at its colony too, lest it will have direct bearing on the working of its Mines at the work-premises. Therefore, it is the contention of the Company that the Standing Orders apply to the behaviour of the workman on the premises and even in the residential colony of the Company. The Company has also framed "Occupancy Rules" which govern the behaviour of the employees in the Annexure 'B' quarters provided to them by the Company. (Annexure 'B').

12. With reference to paragraphs 12 and 13 of the statement, it is denied that the Company is not justified to take action against the workman for an assault on another workman. It is the submission of the Company that the order of dismissal was just as he was found guilty of the misbehaviour mentioned in the chargesheet. The Standing Orders cover the said misconduct and accordingly entail punishment of dismissal. It is the contention of the company that the chargesheet and the subsequent enquiry go to the root of the matter in deciding that the Standing Orders do cover the misconduct committed by the workman concerned.

13. With reference to paragraph 14 of the statement, it is the contention of the Company that it was the choice of the workman (assaulted) whether to complain to the Management or to prosecute Mr. Muthuswami in Criminal Court. Once the complaint was received by the Management, it had to take further action on it.

14. With reference to paragraph 15 of the statement, it is the Company's submission that the incident which took place in the residential colony of the Company has a bearing on the normal working of the Company. The breach of peace was threatened and it was serious matter which was intimately connected with the employment, in that the peace of the residential colony was important in maintaining normal working of the Mines.

15. With reference to paragraph 16 of the statement, the Company submits that the statements made in the said paragraph are irrelevant. It is the contention of the Company that even in Goa the Penal provisions are not mitigated.

16. With reference to paragraph 17 of the statement, the Company submits that the statements are mere repetition and as it has already been covered, needs no further comments.

17. With reference to paragraph 18 of the statement, it is denied that the action of the Company in dismissing Mr. Muthuswami was illegal. In view of past bad record of the workman concerned and in spite of lenient view taken on many occasions, since no improvement could be seen in his behaviour, a further lenient view was not possible any more. It is the submission of the Company that after just, fair and impartial domestic enquiry, the Company arrived at this decision.

18. With reference to paragraph 19 of the statement, the Company submits that justice demanded that he should be removed from the Company's employment. The Company further submits that in view of the facts stated hereinabove and in its written statement, the workman is not entitled for any relief of reinstatement.

19. With reference to paragraph 20 of the statement, it is denied that the dismissal order is illegal.

8 G of I/74—8

20. With reference to paragraph 21 of the statement, it is respectfully submitted that the Director was within his right in bona-fide exercise of his powers to dismiss Mr. Muthuswami which he chose to do in the circumstances mentioned in the Company's written statement dated 14th August, 1973.

21. With reference to paragraph 22 of the statement, it is respectfully submitted that the order of dismissal is lawful and justified and that no case has been made out by the workman for the interference of this Hon'ble Tribunal with the lawful and justified order of the Company.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the reference be rejected.

The Company craves leave to add to, alter or amend the aforesaid rejoinder as and when necessary.

Dated this 19th day of January, 1974.

per pro CHOWGULE & CO. PRIVATE LTD.  
Sd/-

I, Padabettu Bhagavath Raghupathi Rao, the General Manager of Chowgule and Co. Private Limited do hereby declare that what is stated in the above Rejoinder is true to my knowledge, information and belief.

Signed and verified by me at Mormugao Harbour aforesaid this 19th day of January 1974.

Sd/-

N. K. VANI, Presiding Officer.  
[No. L-29012(18)/73-LR IV]

**S.O. 1084.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs. Satna Cement Works Limited, Post Office Sagmania, District Satna and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 29th March, 1974.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
cum-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR

CAMP AT ALLAHABAD

Case No. CGIT/LC(R) (18) of 1973

(Notification No. L-29012/28/72-LR, IV dated 28-7-1973)

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Sagmania Limestone Quarry of M/s. Satna Cement Works Limited, Post Office Sagmania, Distt. Satna and their workmen, Sri Brijlal, Canteen Boy, C/o Sri A. K. Pandey, Khadan Shramik Sangh, P.O. Sagmania, District Satna (M.P.)

Appearance :

For employers.—Sri M. L. Mathur, Personnel Officer.

For workmen.—Sri A. K. Pandey.

Industry : Limestone.

District : Satna (M.P.)

AWARD

This is a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

The workman concerned, Brijlal, was employed as a Canteen Boy in the Sagmania Limestone Quarry of M/s Satna Cement Works Ltd., Satna (hereinafter called the management). The services of Brijlal were terminated by the management with effect from 7-8-1971. The question referred to me for adjudication is whether the termination of Brijlal's services was justified and if not to what relief is he entitled to.

The workman had authorised Sri A. K. Pandey of the Khadan Shramik Sangh (hereinafter called the Shramik Sangh) to represent his case before the Assistant Labour

Commissioner (Central) Jabalpur. The representative of the management could not appear before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Jabalpur in person but in its written reply the management took up the stand that there was no dispute between the parties.

Thereafter conciliation proceedings were initiated. The Assistant Labour Officer of the management, Shri Y. C. Gupta, attended the proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Jabalpur on 28-11-1972 and requested for adjournment of the proceedings. It appears that barring the aforesaid motion for adjournment made by the representative of the management the latter did not participate in the conciliation proceedings besides seeking adjournment to which the representative of the Shramik Sangh did not agree. The conciliation proceedings ended in failure and thereafter the present dispute was referred to this Tribunal.

It was stated on behalf of the management that Brijlal was working as a Canteen Boy in the Management's Canteen. One Devraj Darwan who was on duty on 3-7-1971 in Shift 'C' starting from 10 p.m. reported a theft of utensils in the Canteen. The aforesaid utensils were kept in the Canteen and the keys of the Canteen were handled by two Canteen boys viz. Brijlal and Moti Chand. Moti Chand was on duty on 3-7-1971 up to 6.30 p.m. Having locked the canteen's main door Moti Chand took the keys of the Canteen to his house. Brijlal was on duty in the night shift from 10 p.m. on 3-7-1971. According to the management, Moti Chand had given the keys of the Canteen to Brijlal at 9.35 p.m. Brijlal went to the time keeping office at 10 p.m. for reporting himself for duty. After depositing the attendance card he started for the canteen. On the way he was said to have met Devraj, Darwan, who was also on the night duty. Brijlal asked Devraj to accompany him up to the Canteen. The aforesaid conversation between Brijlal and Devraj was said to have taken place at a spot which was about 220 yards from the Canteen. On Brijlal's insistence Devraj accompanied him to the Canteen but Brijlal alone went in side the Canteen leaving behind Devraj and opened the lock of the Canteen and thereafter Devraj and Brijlal entered inside the Canteen but Brijlal proceeded straight towards the second door of the canteen hall and told Devraj that a door was not bolted from inside. Devraj asked Brijlal to go near the door to find out whether the door was bolted or not. Brijlal thereupon went near the door and told Devraj that the door was not bolted from inside. Thereafter Brijlal went inside the kitchen and immediately said that three Bhagnas and five Thalies were missing. An investigation regarding the theft of the utensils was made on 6-7-1971 in the course of which statements of the persons concerned were taken. Mr. Mathur made an investigation with regard to the incidence in question and submitted his report Ex. E/16.

According to E.W. 1 Angad Singh only the Satna Cement Factory Thatha Quarry Mazdoor Congress (hereinafter called the Mazdoor Congress) is functioning in the quarry and no other Union is functioning there at present. He stated that earlier about an year back there was a Union affiliated to the Communist Party but it has now ceased to function. The name of the aforesaid Communist Union was the Quarry Kamgar Mazdoor Sangh. He further stated that there was no Union of the name of Khadan Mazdoor Sangh functioning in the Quarry. According to him, at the time when the Communist Union was functioning settlements between the management and the workmen used to take place between the management and the aforesaid two unions. Angad Singh stated that Brijlal was a member of the Mazdoor Congress and he had given to the Mazdoor Congress a representation with regard to the earlier incidence of theft, Ex. E/5. Thereupon the Mazdoor Congress sent a letter to the management on 17-3-1971 (Ex. F/7). According to Angad Singh, it was the Mazdoor Congress which had raised the dispute with regard to the present incident in question before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-conciliation Officer Satna and there were conciliation proceedings with regard to the incidence in question before Mr. C. K. Saxena. He also referred to letters Ex. E/8 and Ex. W/2. According to him, Brijlal was given a warning with regard to the earlier incidence of theft (Ex. E/1). Angad Singh further stated that both Moti Chand and Brijlal were involved in the incidence of theft in question and their services had been terminated by the management. On the intervention of the Mazdoor Congress

the management agreed to deal with Brijlal in the same manner as it had dealt with Moti Chand. The witness (E.W. 1) further referred to the terms of the settlement between the Mazdoor Congress and the management with regard to Brijlal (Ex. E/9) and he identified the signature of Kanahaiya Singh, General Secretary of the Mazdoor Congress. He has also stated that in consultation with Brijlal and after Moti Chand had taken the money in terms of the settlement his Union entered into a settlement with the management (Ex. E/9) with regard to Brijlal. He also referred to a copy of the Resolution of the Mazdoor Congress dated 8-6-1972 (Ex. E/10) and further referred to the letter of the Mazdoor Congress to the management Ex. E/11.

Sri Mohan Lal Mathur (E. W. 4) was the Personnel Officer of the Satna Cement Works, Satna at the time of the incidence. He had asked Mr. Gupta to take the statements of the workmen soon after the discovery of the alleged theft. According to Mr. Mathur, Narain Singh and Brijlal came to see him on 6-7-1971. Mr. Gupta was also present at that time. Mr. Mathur enquired from Brijlal as to what he had to say about the theft in question. Brij Lal's statement was recorded by Mr. Gupta in presence of Sri Mohan Lal Mathur. After his statement had been recorded Mr. Mathur asked Brijlal whether he had said anything under compulsion or intimidation. Thereupon he wrote on his statement that it had been given by him freely of without any compulsion. After it had been read over to him he put his signature in his statement. Narain Singh who was present at that time also put his signature on the statement of Brijlal. The aforesaid statement is Ex. E/3. Mr. Mathur also went to the scene of the occurrence and prepared a report of the investigation made by him (Ex. E/16) and submitted it to the Mines Manager. Mr. Mathur further stated that prior to the incident in question there had been another theft in the Quarry and that too had taken place at the time of handing over charge between Moti Chand and Brijlal and in that connection Brijlal had been given a warning. The Satna Cement Factory Thatha Quarry Mazdoor Congress had made a request to the management for taking a lenient view of the earlier incidence of theft. The dispute relating to it had gone up to the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, Satna in conciliation. The dispute with regard to the incident of theft on 3-7-1971 was taken up before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer in conciliation and the latter took cognisance of the dispute as would appear from letter Ex. E/5 and the workman's letter to the Mines Manager for his reinstatement Ex. W/2.

Before I proceed further it is necessary to mention that more than one union have been functioning in the Sagmania Limestone Quarry of Satna Cement Works Ltd. Satna.

The case of the workman has now been sponsored by Sri A. K. Pandey who according to the workman is the General Secretary of the M.P. Khan Avan Nirmanik Shramik Sangh. Mr. Pandey himself admitted that the aforesaid Nirmanik Shramik Sangh had come into existence on 28-11-1973.

It is not at all clear as to how the present dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central) Jabalpur was sponsored by the Khadan Shramik Sangh. As mentioned above, the workman's representative before me was Sri A. K. Pandey. It appears that formerly he was associated with Sri Kanhaiya Singh who was the President of the Mazdoor Congress and Brij Lal had raised the dispute earlier through the Mazdoor Congress which had culminated in the aforesaid agreements between the management and Brijlal and Moti Chand. Now it appears that Brijlal having denounced the aforesaid agreement entered into by him with the management his cause has now been taken over by Sri Pandey. One of the questions for consideration therefore would be whether under these circumstances Mr. Pandey could properly sponsor the present dispute on behalf of Brijlal.

As mentioned above soon after the incidence in question there was an enquiry by the management in course of which the statements of Brijlal and Moti Chand were recorded before Shri M. L. Mathur. Brijlal tried to show that it was when he had reached the Canteen along with Devraj that he discovered about the theft. There are infirmities in his statement from which it could be said that he was trying to shift the responsibility about the theft from himself and

show that it had taken place without his knowledge. In his investigation report Ex. E/16 Shri Mathur has stated that :—

"As regards details of the theft of utensils, he stated that he peeped through a hole in the door of the store where utensils were lying and at the same time he admitted that the entire Store could not be seen through the hole in the door."

He further said :—

"Motichand, Canteen Roy, who had given the keys of the Canteen to Brijlal, stated that the theft of the Canteen utensils must have been taken place in between 6-30 P.M. to 10.00 P.M. He confirmed that prior to this theft in February there was a theft of money which was also occurred during the same change over period."

Mr. Mathur expressed the view that the statement of Brijlal was full of ambiguity for the reasons which he had mentioned in his report. He was of the view that even without checking the utensils in the store which was locked, Brijlal had told Devraj the items of utensils that had been stolen which indicated that Brijlal had "pre-knowledge of the whole affair".

Mr. Mathur after recording the statement of Brijlal himself made an enquiry in the Canteen and made a report (Ex. E/16) which was submitted by him to the Mines Manager, Sri S. V. Pai. Thereafter the dispute with regard to the incident was taken to the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, Satna who seized the dispute as would appear from Ex. E/8.

The services of Brijlal were terminated by a letter of the management addressed to him dated 6-8-1971. The notice terminating the Brijlal's services is Ex. W/1. It says:—

(Translation is mine).—There was a theft on 3-7-1971 in the Quarry Canteen at night between 6.30 to 10.15 P.M. in which utensils of the Canteen were stolen. In that connection your statement and statements of some other connected persons were taken. From your statement it appears that you were also in this theft (Sharik the). Earlier also there had been theft and the enquiries showed that they had taken place in between your shift and that of Motichand. From your conduct the management's confidence in you has gone. Under these circumstances it is not desirable to retain you in the Company's service.

Therefore your services are terminated from 7-8-1971 under Standing Order 11(a) and you are given one month's wages in lieu of notice.....".

Meanwhile Brijlal had given a letter to the Mines Manager for his reinstatement (Ex. W/2). In course of the conciliation proceedings before the Assistant Labour Commissioner-cum-Conciliation Officer, Satna, a settlement was arrived at between the management and the Union representing Brijlal in the same manner as the settlement had been arrived at between the management and Motichand. The said agreement is Ex. E/9. It was entered on behalf of the management by Shri M. L. Mathur, Personnel Officer and on behalf of the workmen by Sri Kanahaiya Singh, General Secretary, Satna Cement Factory Tatha Quarry Mazdoor Congress. It says:—

(Translation in mine).—On 3-7-1972 the services of Brijlal Canteen Boy were terminated due to loss of confidence in him in connection with the theft of Company's utensils from the Quarry Canteen. In this connection today dated 19-6-1972 there has been the following settlement between the parties:—

- (1) That the Union does not wish to take any action against the charges levelled against Brijlal.
- (2) It has been decided that the management will give Brijlal all his dues upto 26-6-1972.

(3) It was further decided that the management shall give to Brijlal Rs. 300 over and above the aforesaid amount due to him as an act of kindness (Mehrabani) in lieu of his service (Naukari).

(4) It has been decided that the Union withdraws the dispute.

(5) It has been decided that a copy of the settlement should be sent to the Conciliation Officer, Satna with the request that after ending the conciliation proceedings this dispute should be ended."

It was contended on behalf of the workman that the Mazdoor Congress had taken up the dispute before the Conciliation Officer on its own and it was not raised by the workman himself and further that the State Labour Court had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter nor the Mazdoor Congress was competent to enter into a settlement with regard to the dispute between the management. There is, however, not much evidence to show that Brijlal was a member of the Union represented by Sri A. K. Pandey or that he was not a member of the Mazdoor Congress which had sponsored the dispute on his behalf before the Conciliation Officer Satna. Brijlal admitted in his cross-examination that when he joined service in the Quarry he was a member of the Mazdoor Congress. He however stated that Sri A. K. Pandey used to work for the Mazdoor Congress and was also its member. He was confronted with a copy of his letter dated 8-1-1971 which was given by him to the Mazdoor Congress and he admitted that it was given by him. He has further admitted that he had not given a copy of the same to represent him in his dispute with the management. Nor believe that Brijlal had not authorised Sri Kanahaiya Singh to represent him in his dispute with the management. Nor there is any evidence to indicate that at the time when the aforesaid settlement was arrived at on behalf of Brijlal between Sri Kanahaiya Singh and the management it was done against the wishes or without the knowledge of Brijlal. It appears that it was after the aforesaid settlement that he was persuaded by Sri Pandey to raise the dispute afresh and he did not accept the amount of Rs. 300 which was given to him under the said agreement. Even assuming that the Conciliation Officer, Satna had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter the aforesaid agreement was arrived at between the Mazdoor Congress representing Brijlal and the management and I am not prepared to disregard it. As mentioned above, the evidence on the record indicates that Sri Kanahaiya Singh and the Mazdoor Congress were fully justified in representing the cause of Brijlal in his dispute with the management and the Mazdoor Congress entered into the aforesaid settlements with the management with regard to Motichand and Brijlal after fully safeguarding their interest. The earlier theft and the theft in question had shaken the confidence of the management in both Brijlal and Motichand and it could not be said that the management had acted without justification in terminating the services of Brijlal and Motichand.

There is, however, one aspect of the dispute which requires consideration. If the management in its notice terminating the services of Brijlal (Ex. W/1) had merely said that the services were being terminated there would have been no scope for any controversy. The wordings of the notice, however, show that in the view of the management Brijlal was implicated in the theft and it cast of a stigma on him and under these circumstances the management could not have terminated his service without giving him an opportunity to defend himself. If there had been no settlement I would have had no hesitation in quashing the order of the management terminating Brijlal's services. There is an agreement between the Mazdoor Congress representing Brijlal and the management in which it was agreed that the workman would be content with receiving the amount as mentioned in the agreement and the dispute between him and the management would not be pressed. There is nothing to show that the aforesaid agreement had been brought about by any pressure exercised on the workman. The agreement in the context of the circumstances in question appears to be fair and reasonable. There was an incident of theft earlier in which the management had taken a lenient view against Brijlal. In the present case action had been taken against Brijlal and Motichand and the latter had accepted the terms of the settlement and had not raised any further dispute.

I see no reason why Brijlal in the present dispute should be allowed to resile from the agreement which was arrived at on his behalf with the management. I am, therefore, of the view that the action of the management in terminating the services of Brijlal was justified.

My award, therefore, is that the action of the management in terminating the services of Brijlal, Canteen Boy, with effect from 7-8-1971 was justified and he is not entitled to any relief. In view, however, of the circumstances of the case I allow Brijlal Rs. 300 as costs. The aforesaid amount of costs will be paid in addition to the amount of Rs. 300 which shall be paid by the management to Brijlal in terms of the settlement dated 19-6-1972 (Ex. E/9) between the parties.

S. N. KATJU, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-29012/28/72-LR.IV]

New Delhi, the 18th April, 1974.

**S.O. 1085.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Bank of Madura Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th April, 1974.

BEFORE THIRU T. PALANIAPPAN, B.A., B.L.,

PRESIDING OFFICER  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, MADRAS

(Constituted by the Central Government)

Industrial Dispute No. 40 of 1973

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the management of Bank of Madura Limited, Madurai—1).

BETWEEN

The workmen represented by

The General Secretary Bank of Madura Employees Union. No. 378, North Masi Street, Madurai—1.

AND

The Chairman, Bank of Madura Limited, 33, North Chitrai Street, Madurai—1.

#### Reference :

Order No. L-12011/10/73-LR.III, dated 6th August, 1973 of the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment, Government of India, New Delhi.

This dispute coming on for final hearing on Thursday the 14th day of March, 1974, upon perusing the reference, claim and counter statements and all other material papers on record and upon hearing the arguments of Thiruvallargal B. R. Dolia, A.L. Somayaji and R. Jamal Zazeem, Advocates for the workmen and of Thiru M. R. Narayanaswami, Advocate for the management and having stood over till this day for consideration, this Tribunal made the following.

#### AWARD

This is an industrial dispute between the employers and the workmen of the Bank of Madura Limited referred to by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation for adjudication by this Tribunal.

2. The issue referred to for adjudication is as follows:—

“Whether the management of Bank of Madura Limited have violated the terms and conditions of the Agreement dated the 20th June, 1970 arrived at between the Bank and the Union? If so, to what relief the union members are entitled and to what extent?”

3. The Joint Secretary of the Bank of Madura Employees Union has filed a claim statement stating that since there was no uniform policy or principle followed in regard

to promotions, the claimant union in its Eighth Annual General Body meeting held on 4.5.1969 resolved to request the respondent to evolve a rational promotion policy and so the office-bearers of the claimant union had discussion with the management for evolving a promotion policy in respect of promotion of subordinate staff to clerical cadre and clerical staff to Officer's cadre, and the last of such discussions took place on 19-6-1970 resulting in an agreement between the claimant and the respondent Management; that the Chairman of the respondent by the letter dated 20-6-1970 was informed about the agreement reached as a result of discussions and negotiations, and he accepted the same and the respondent management by their letter dated 26-6-1970 acknowledged the receipt of letter sent by the Union on 20-6-1970. It is further stated that the respondent on the basis of the agreement promoted clerical staff to Officer's cadre; that the respondent enclosed two sets of list of seniority members of the staff to claimant union along with the letter dated 21-10-1970, so as to enable the claimant union to give names for promotions for higher cadres in accordance with the management and accordingly the claimant gave the names of staff for promotion. The claim statement further states that respondent requested a list of staff for the purposes of promotion and it was furnished by the claimant on 4-8-1971 and the union suggested certain modification and afterwards on various dated the respondents called upon the claimant union to submit the list and the orders of promotions were issued on the basis of the agreement. The union states that contrary to the agreement namely that 60 per cent of promotion from clerical cadre to Office cadre and 40 per cent by direct recruitment, the respondent during the year 1972 appointed about 50 persons directly as officers without giving any intimation to the union and without promoting the existing clerks to officers cadre as agreed upon. The claimant union protested against the violation of the agreement dated 20-6-1970. But the respondent took up a stand, namely that the persons recruited as Officers directly were apprentices to be trained and absorbed as Officers against future vacancies and hence there was no necessity to be intimated to the claimant union about the same. The union states that all those directly recruited officers under the name of 'apprentices' are performing the day to-day official duties pertaining to the officers. The claimant further states that the respondent did not fill up vacancies and contrary to the agreement appointed about 10 persons to the officers cadre on contract basis and thus violated the terms of the agreement by resorting to unfair labour practice. Finally it is stated that the respondent's action in making recruitment both in the cadre of officers and clerks in utter disregard of the settlement dated 20-6-1970 is abinitio-void and contravenes Section 9-A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

4. The respondent Bank has filed a counter statement contending that the reference proceeds on the basis as if there is an agreement between the parties dated 20-6-1970 and that the agreement has been violated; that it is a misnomer to describe the tentative understanding reached between the parties on 20-6-1970 as an agreement; that the very basis of the reference is lacking and that the reference itself is very vague and there is no indication as which terms and conditions of agreement have been violated by the management. The next contention is that it is the prerogative of the management to decide upon and to lay down the policy of promotion of its employees from one grade to another grade or from one post to another post, except in cases where the matter is governed by an agreement; that on 20-6-1970, the Union wrote a letter to the management referring to an understanding that it has been made clear by the issue referred for adjudication are two fold: (1) Whether from Clerks to Officers would be purely on seniority-cum-merit, and that the union had deliberately omitted to refer to this aspect of this case, which has been recorded by a memorandum of settlement dated 16-6-1971; that if the understanding tentatively reached on 20-6-1970 is to be construed as an agreement, the subsequent memorandum dated 16-6-1971 also should be read as part of the agreement. The last contention is that there is no scope for the application of 9-A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

5. On the side of the Union Thiru S. Sundaram W.W. I was examined and Exs. W-1 to W-21 were marked. On behalf of the management no oral evidence was adduced, but only documentary evidence Ex. M-1 was marked.

6. The points that arise for determination under this in the issue referred for adjudication are two fold: (1) Whether the alleged agreement dated 20th June, 1970 is an agreement

known in the Industrial Disputes Act, and (2) whether the Management of the Bank of Madura Limited violated the terms and conditions of the alleged agreement dated 20th June, 1970.

7. I will take up the first question, namely whether the document Ex. W-16 dated 20-6-1970 is an agreement. The union pressed into service Ex. W-1 which is a typed copy of original of Ex. W-16 and alleging that it is an agreement entered into between the management and the union. Before dealing with the question of law on this aspect, I will refer to the evidence on the side of the workers on this aspect of the matter called the agreement. W.W. 1 is the Joint Secretary of the Bank of Madura Employees' Union. In the course of the chief examination he stated that on behalf of the Bank, the then Chairman initialled in the agreement Ex. W-15; that Ex. W-16 is the original of Ex. W-1. W.W. 1 has further stated that on the basis of agreement, Ex. W-15, the Bank agreed to promote clerical staff to Officers cadre. Ex. W-15 is dated 19-6-1970. It is a letter from the union to the management regarding the promotion policy. I find that certain sub-clauses under clause No. 2 are scored out in pencil and on the left hand margin there are also some pencil writings. It is only in this letter at the bottom there is a recital "agreed on behalf of the management" initialled by somebody. Thus there is not even the signature of the Chairman of the Bank in token of having accepted the agreement. The Union itself is not sure as to whether this document Ex. W-15 is the agreement or Ex. W-16, i.e. the original of Ex. W-1 is the agreement. Ex. W-16 is the letter by the Secretary of the Union to the Chairman of the Bank of Madura Limited. It is dated 20th June, 1970. This document has not been signed or initialled by any of the representative of the Bank such as the Chairman or anybody authorised on behalf of the Bank. Thiru S. Sundaram, W.W. 1, the Joint Secretary of the Union has stated in the course of the evidence that Ex. W-16 is the alleged agreement violated by the Bank, that it is only in Ex. W-15 the Chairman has initialled and the Chairman gave Ex. W-15 to him and keeping one another in the Bank. Thus the Joint Secretary of Employees' Union, that is W.W. 1 himself is not sure as to whether Ex. W-15 or Ex. W-16 is the agreement said to have been violated by the management. In the course of the chief examination his evidence is that on the basis of the agreement Ex. W-15, the Bank agreed for the rationalisation of the promotion. I have already shown that Ex. W-15 is only a letter written by the General Secretary of the Union to the Bank of Madura and it is only a letter dated 19th June, 1970 and it is only at the bottom somebody has initialled dated 20-6-1970 stating "agreed on behalf of the management". Ex. W-16 is dated 20th June, 1970, and it is a letter by the Joint Secretary of the Union to the Chairman of the Bank of Madura and it is not signed by both the parties to the agreement. In the course of the re-examination an attempt was made by the counsel for the union to clarify the position as to whether Ex. W-15 or Ex. W-16 is the agreement. To a question put by the learned counsel for the union W.W. 1 stated that in Ex. W-15 dated 19th June, 1970, the Chairman has signed on 20-6-1970 and it is only the copy of Ex. W-15 that was sent by post on 20-6-1970. Here again the Bank cannot contend that Exs. W-15 and W-16 are one and the same because, some of the sub-clauses under clause No. 2 in Ex. W-15 are scored out, thus Ex. W-15 is not a true copy of Ex. W-16.

8. Even assuming for the sake of argument that Ex. W-15 even though dated 19th June, 1970 is an agreement, the question to be decided is whether the Employees' Union can ask this Tribunal to enforce this document Ex. W-15. Section 2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act defines an agreement or settlement and it is as follows:—

"Settlement means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceeding and includes a written agreement between the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to (an officer authorised in this behalf by) the appropriate Government and the Conciliation Officer".

Thus it is seen that the agreement should have been signed by the parties and a copy should have been sent to the appropriate Government and the Conciliation Officer.

Rule 58 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 reads as follows:—

"58. Memorandum of settlement.—(1) A settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings or otherwise, shall be in Form 'H'.

(2) The settlement shall be signed by—

- (a) in the case of an employer, by the employer himself, or by his authorised agent, or when the employer is an incorporated Company or other body corporate, by the agent, manager or other principal officer of the corporation;
- (b) in the case of the workmen, by any officer of a trade union of the workmen or by five representatives of the workmen duly authorised in this behalf at a meeting of the workmen held for the purpose.

**Explanation.**—In this rule 'officer' means any of the following officers, namely:—

- (a) The President;
  - (b) the Vice-President;
  - (c) the Secretary (including the General Secretary);
  - (d) a Joint Secretary;
  - (e) any other officer of the trade union authorised in this behalf by the President and Secretary of the Union.
- (3) Where a settlement is arrived in the course of conciliation proceeding the Conciliation Officer shall send a report thereof to the Central Government together with a copy of the memorandum of settlement signed by the parties to the dispute.
- (4) Where a settlement is arrived at between an employer and his workmen otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding before a Board or Conciliation Officer, the parties to the settlement shall jointly send a copy thereof to the Central Government, the Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) New Delhi, and the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) and to the Conciliation Officer (Central) concerned.

Thus it is seen that the settlement arrived at should be in the prescribed form as per Rule 58 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957. The learned counsel for the management Bank referred me to a decision reported in 1972-1-L.L.J. page 99 Supreme Court (workmen of Delhi Cloth and General Mills Ltd. Vs. Delhi Cloth and General Mills Ltd.). In that decision Section 2(p), Section 18(1), Section 38-Rule 58 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules came up for consideration. It is seen from the decision that the agreement relied upon in that case was not entered into as contemplated in the Industrial Disputes Act and so its validity was in question. Their Lordships of the Supreme Court in para 14 at page 106 have laid down as follows:—

"The respondent's learned advocate in reply obliquely suggested in this connection that the management and the union were free to arrive at a Settlement of their dispute and if they agreed to do so then the agreement could not but be held to be binding. We do not think the management and the union can, when a dispute is referred to the Conciliation Officer, claim absolute freedom of contract to arrive at a statement in all respect binding on all workmen, to which no objection whatsoever can ever be raised by the workmen feeling aggrieved. The question of a valid and binding settlement in such circumstances is, in our opinion, governed by the statute and the rules made thereunder. Reliance was next placed on S. 18(1) to support the binding character of the settlement. This sub-section for its proper construction must be read with the other sub-section and the relevant rules, in the light of the definition of 'settlement' as contained in S.2(p) of the Industrial Disputes Act. "Settlement" as defined therein means a settlement arrived at in the course of conciliation proceedings and includes a written agreement bet-

ween the employer and workmen arrived at otherwise than in the course of conciliation proceeding where such agreement has been signed by the parties thereto in such manner as may be prescribed and a copy thereof has been sent to the appropriate Government and the Conciliation Officer. In the light of these provisions we do not think that S.18(1) vests in the management and the union unfettered freedom to settle the dispute as they please and clothes it with a binding effect on all workmen or even on all member workmen of the union. The settlement has to be in compliance with the statutory provisions."

Thus it is seen the settlement if at all relied upon by parties relating to industrial disputes should be in conformity with Section 2(p) of the Act and Rule 58 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957. Neither Ex. W-15 nor Ex. W-16 can be said to be the agreement. In the face of this decision there is no force in the contention of the learned counsel for the union that the parties were free to arrive at a settlement for the dispute in any manner they like without strictly observing to the form and method contemplated under the Industrial Disputes Act. The learned counsel for the union referred me to a decision reported in 1967-1-I.L.L.J. page 423 Supreme Court (Delhi Cloth and General Mills Company, Ltd., Vs. Their workmen and others) for contending that parties cannot be allowed to challenge the basis of the issue set forth in the order of reference. This ruling was pressed into service for the purpose of showing that the management Bank cannot contend that the agreement referred to in the order of reference is not an agreement and that the reference has not been properly worded. In my opinion the decision 1967-1-I.L.L.J. page 423 is not applicable to the facts of the instant case and we have got a recent ruling of the Supreme Court, namely 1972-1-I.L.L.J. page 99 (Workmen of Delhi Cloth and General Mills Ltd., Vs. Delhi Cloth and General Mills Ltd.) wherein the exact question that arise for determination in this case came up for consideration and decided by their Lordships. The decision reported in 1972-1-I.L.L.J. page 99 is on all fours with the facts of our case and it is a direct decision applicable to the facts of our case. I hold that the Union cannot press into service either Ex. W-15 or Ex. W-16 as an agreement said to have been violated by the Bank. Further W.W. 1 has admitted in the course of the cross-examination that the agreement entered into by them was not sent to the Regional Labour Commissioner or to any other Labour Officer. Section 2(p) reads that, it should be sent to the appropriate Government and the Conciliation Officer, Rule 58, sub-clause 4 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 is that where a settlement is arrived at between an employer and the workmen otherwise in the course of conciliation proceeding before a Board or a Conciliation Officer, the parties to the settlement shall jointly send a copy hereof to the appropriate Government, the Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi, and the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) and to the Conciliation Officer (Central) concerned. This has not been done in the instant case. Under those circumstances I am of the view that it cannot be said that the Bank violated the terms and conditions of the alleged agreement dated 20-6-1970.

9. The learned counsel for the management bank argued that in case, the objection namely, that in case this argument that either Ex.W-15 or Ex.W-16 are not agreements as contemplated in the industrial law is not accepted by this Tribunal, the union is not entitled to any of the reliefs prayed for in the face of Ex.M-1 which is an agreement subsequent to Ex.W-15 and W-16 entered into between the union and the management. Ex.M-1 was pressed into service by the management showing that it is an agreement reached on the discussions held on the 16th June, 1971 between the management of the Bank of Madura Limited and the Bank of Madura Employees Union; that Ex.M-1 is a copy of the original agreement. The union did not dispute the genuineness of Ex.M-1. Ex.M-1 shows that promotion policy of clerks to officers will be purely seniority-cum-merit in terms of the union's letter dated 20-6-1970; that so far as promotions of sub-staff to clerk, 4 persons will be promoted after a simple test. Even in case that Ex.W-15 or Ex.W-16 is an agreement, there cannot be any violation of the alleged agreement dated 20th June, 1970, because that agreement has been superseded by a new agreement Ex.M-1. The rights of the union will be governed only by the terms of Ex.M-1. Ex.M-1

shows that so far as promotion of clerks to officers, it will be purely on seniority-cum-merit and so far as promotion of sub-staff to clerk, 4 persons will be promoted now after a simple test. In any view of the matter, the union is not entitled to the relief asked for.

10. In the result, I hold that the Union is not entitled to any of the reliefs on the ground that there was violation of the alleged agreement dated 20-6-1970. An award is passed accordingly. There will be no order as to costs.

Dated, this 20th day of March, 1974.

T. PALANIAPPAN, Presiding Officer

#### WITNESSES EXAMINED

For workmen  
W.W.1—Thiru S. Sundaram.  
For management  
None.

#### DOCUMENTS MARKED

For workmen  
Ex. W-1/20-6-'70—Letter from the union to the Management in respect of promotion policy (copy).  
Ex.W-2/25-6-'70—Letter from the Management acknowledging Ex.W-1 (copy).  
Ex. W-3/10-7-'71—Letter from the union to the Management enclosing a list of employees to be promoted (copy).  
Ex. W-4/4-8-'71—do—  
Ex.W-5/4-8-'71—Letter from the union to the Management regarding promotion policy (copy).  
Ex.W-6/5-8-'71—Letter from the union to the management requesting to include Thiru S. Berchman, Defendant in the list of employees to be promoted (copy).  
Ex.W-7/26-10-'71—letter from the union to the Management regarding promotion (copy).  
Ex. W-8/12-11-'71—Letter from the Management to the union requesting to furnish the names of 20 senior members. (copy).  
Ex. W-9/12-11-'71—Letter from the union to the Management enclosing a list of senior employees to be promoted (copy).  
Ex. W-10/12-11-'71—Letter from the Management to the union informing the names of staff who are promoted (copy).  
Ex. W-11/7-12-'71—Order of promotion issued to Thiru K. Ramalingam (copy).  
Ex. W-12/24-6-'72—Letter from the union to the Management regarding recruitment of officers (copy).  
Ex. W-13/29-6-'72—Reply letter by the Management to Ex.W-12 of the union (copy).  
Ex. W-14/21-2-'74—Letter from the union to the Management regarding recruitment of officers in the Bank (copy).  
Ex. W-15/19-6-'70—Letter from the union to the Management regarding promotion policy.  
Ex. W-16/20-6-'70—Original of Ex. W-1.  
Ex. W-17/25-6-'70—Original of Ex. W-2.  
Ex.W-18 series—Photostat copies of chalans in triplicate. (5 Nos).  
Ex. W-19/9-2-'73—Photostat copy of Deposit receipt.

Ex. W-20/4-12-73—Circular issued by the Bank granting powers of attorney to the officers mentioned (copy).

Ex. W-21/14-7-72—Order of appointment issued to Thiru H. Ramaswamy Aiyer (copy).

*For Management :*

Ex.M-1—Agreement between the parties reached on the discussion held on 16-6-71. (copy).

T. PALANIAPPAN, Industrial Tribunal.

Note: The parties are informed that they should take their ps/document/s within six months from the date of the Award.

T. PALANIAPPAN, Presiding Officer.

[No. L. 12011/10/73/(RHH)]

P. P. KANTHAN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 1974

**S.O. 1086.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Orissa, Bhubaneswar in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Hindustan General Electrical Corporation (Private) Limited, Post Office, Barbil, District Keonjhar and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th April, 1974.

**BEFORE PRESIDING OFFICER**

**INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL : ORISSA : BHUBANESWAR**

**Present :**

Shri L. Mallick, B.L., Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Orissa.

**Industrial Dispute Case No. 3 of 1973 (Central)**

Dated Bhubaneswar, the 27th March, 1974

**BETWEEN**

The Management of Hindustan General Electrical Corporation (Private) Limited, Post Office Barbil, District Keonjhar. First Party.

**AND**

Their Workman

Second Party

**Appearances :**

Sri S. K. Jahanjee, Administrative Officer, Hindustan General Electrical Corporation (Private) Limited.  
For the First Party.

Sri S. S. Pati, Vice President, North Orissa Workers' Union.  
For the Second Party.

**AWARD**

The Central Government in the Department of Labour and Employment, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 have by their order No. L-29012/27/73-LRIV dated 6-9-1973 referred the following schedule of dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

"Whether refusal of employment to Shri Routray Munda, H. V. Driver, with effect from the 30th January, 1973 by Messrs Hindustan General Electrical Corporation (Private) Limited, Post Office Barbil, District Keonjhar was justified. If not to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. Undisputedly Sri Routray Munda who is represented through the General Secretary, North Orissa Workers' Union served under the first party for the period from January 1969 to 29.1.1973.

3. The case of the Union, in short, is as follows :—

That all on a sudden, the Garage-in-charge of the first party refused employment to the workman on and from 30-1-1973 without assigning any reason. Repeated representations submitted by the workman to the Administrative Officer was of no avail to him. The workman committed no misconduct whatsoever in course of his duties. The management violated the principles of natural justice and committed illegality in refusing employment to the workman.

4. The first party has not filed any written statement, though it took time for the same.

5. Now, the question is whether refusal of employment to the workman Sri Routray Munda with effect from 30-1-1973 by the first party was justified. The Vice President of the Union who has been examined as U.W.1 speaks that the workman Sri Munda has been illegally refused employment by the first party. He claims that the workman should be reinstated in service with back wages. The Administrative Officer of the first party being conscious of the fact that the refusal of employment to the workman was not justified, has conceded to reinstate him, but he has started that the workman is not entitled to full back wages. I will come to the question of back wages later. In the view of the evidence on record on either side, I have got to hold that refusal of employment to Shri Routray Munda, H. V. Driver, with effect from the 30th January, 1973 by Messrs Hindustan General Electrical Corporation (Private) Limited, Post Office Barbil, District Keonjhar was not justified.

6. The next question is as to what relief the workman is entitled. In view of my finding above that the refusal of employment to the workman was not justified, the management has to reinstate him in service. As regards the claim for back wages, the Administrative Officer of the first party speaks that the first party is agreeable to pay back wages only for two months, but not full backwages. The Vice President of the Union (U.W. 1) in his cross-examination has said that the workman should be paid back wages at least for 6 months. During the course of argument, the Union did not press hard its claim for full back wages. The Vice President of the Union appreciating the attitude of the management in reinstating the workman in service, has submitted that offer of two months' wages may be acceptable to the Union. Judging the fact that the first party has agreed to reinstate the workman in service and in view of the cordial relationship between the management and the Union, I feel that two months' back wages should be paid to the workman. Therefore, I order that the workman Sri Routray Munda should be reinstated in service forthwith and he should be paid two months' back wages. The reference is answered and award is passed accordingly.

L. MALLICK, Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar.

27-3-1974.

Dictated & corrected by me.

L. MALLICK, B.L., Presiding Officer.

[No. L-29012(27)/73-I.R. IV]

P. P. KANTHAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 अप्रैल, 1974

का० धा० 1087—यतः छावनी बोर्ड, बरेली में संबद्ध नियोजक और इसके कर्मचारियों के बीच, जिनका प्रतिनिधित्व छावनी श्रमिक संघ, बरेली करती है, एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः उक्त नियोजक और कर्मचारियों ने औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10-क की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन उक्त विवाद को उसमें वर्णित व्यक्ति के माध्यमस्त् के लिए निर्देशित करने का करार कर लिया है और उक्त माध्यमस्त् करार की एक प्रति केन्द्रीय सरकार का भेजी गई है ;



पत्र, अब, उस अधिनियम, की धारा 10-क की उपधारा (3) के अनुसार में, केन्द्रीय सरकार उस माध्यस्थ को, जो उसे 6 अप्रैल, 1974 को मिला था, एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

#### करार

(औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 की धारा 10-क के अधीन)  
के बीच

#### पक्षकारों के नाम :

नियोजक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : श्री श्री० एल० धवन,  
छावनी कार्यवाहक अधिकारी,  
छावनी बोर्ड, बरेली छावनी।

कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले : श्री मोहम्मद फरीद, प्रधान, छावनी  
श्रमिक संघ, बरेली छावनी।

पक्षकारों के बीच निम्नलिखित विवाद को श्री श्याम कृष्ण, क्षेत्रीय श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय), कानपुर के माध्यस्थ के लिए निर्दिष्ट करने का एतद्वारा करार किया गया है।

1. विनिश्चित विवाद-प्रश्न बिषय : क्या छावनी बोर्ड, बरेली छावनी की निम्नलिखित 11 पुरुष सफाई कर्मचारियों/महिला सफाई कर्मचारियों को 20 मई, 1972 से सेवानिवृत्त करने की कार्यवाही वायोचित थी ? यदि नहीं, तो प्रभावित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

#### नाम :

1. श्री इतवारि पुत्र श्री गिदार्ह
2. श्री चिरजी पुत्र श्री बाबू
3. श्री गोबिन्द पुत्र श्री फूलचन्द
4. श्री बाबू पुत्र श्री मुखी
5. श्री रामा पुत्र श्री चिहड़ू
6. श्री पुसे पुत्र श्री गिदार्ह
7. श्रीमती टुलारी पत्नी श्री छोटे
8. श्री श्याम लाल पुत्र कल्लू
9. श्री झान्कु पुत्र श्री खेमानी
10. श्रीमती रमा पत्नी श्री मुखी
11. श्रीमती चांगिया पत्नी श्री केवल

(2) विवाद के पक्षकारों का विवरण, छावनी बोर्ड, बरेली छावनी का निम्नलिखित स्थापन या उप-प्रबंधन।  
क्रम के नाम और पते भी संलग्न हैं।

(3) यदि वह स्वयं प्रत्यक्ष है, तो अध्यक्ष, छावनी श्रमिक संघ, बरेली कर्मकार का नाम या यदि कोई संघ छावनी।  
प्रणाल कर्मकार या कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करता हो तो उसका नाम।

(4) प्रभावित उपक्रम में नियोजित लगभग 330  
कर्मकारों की कुल संख्या।

(5) विवाद द्वारा प्रभावित या 11 कर्मकारी, वैवाहिक करार उल्लिखित  
संभावित प्रभावित होने वाले कर्म- किया गया है।  
कारों की प्राक्कलित संख्या।

हम यह करार भी करते हैं कि मध्यस्थ का विनिश्चय हम पर बाध्य कर होगा।

मध्यस्थ अपना पंचाट 3 मास की कालावधि या इतने और समय के भीतर जो हमारे बीच पारस्परिक लिखित करार द्वारा बढ़ाया जाय, देगा।

नियोजक का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले कर्मकारों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले

श्री बी० एल० धवन श्री मोहम्मद फरीद, अध्यक्ष,  
छावनी कार्यवाहक अधिकारी, छावनी श्रमिक संघ,  
छावनी बोर्ड, बरेली।  
बरेली छावनी।

साक्षी : ह०-गुप्त प्रकाश

श्रम प्रवर्तन अधिकारी (क०) बरेली।

2. ह०-प्रभोक्त श्रीवास्तव,  
निम्न श्रेणी लिपिक,

श्रम प्रवर्तन अधिकारी (क०) का कार्यलय, बरेली।

तारीख 15 मार्च, 1974

यै, 11 पुरुष कर्मचारियों और महिला सफाई कर्मचारियों की छठवीं के बारे में छावनी बोर्ड, बरेली और उनके कर्मकारों को बीच विवाद में मध्यस्थ के रूप में काम करना स्वीकार करना है।

ह०-श्याम कृष्ण

क्षेत्रीय श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) कानपुर

[फा० संख्या एल० 13011/1/73-एल० आर०-1]

ए०गुप्त० महसूनामन, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 18th April, 1974

S. O.1087.—Whereas an industrial dispute exists between the employer in relation to the Cantonment Board, Bareilly and its workmen represented by the Cantonment Labour Union, Bareilly;

AND, Whereas the said employer and workmen have, under sub-section (1) of Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), agreed to refer the said dispute to arbitration by the person specified therein, and a copy of the said arbitration agreement has been forwarded to the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 10A of the said Act, the Central Government hereby publishes the said arbitration agreement which was received by it on the 6th April, 1974.

#### AGREEMENT

(Under Section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947)  
BETWEEN

#### Name of the Parties:

Representing employer: Shri B. L. Dhawan,  
Cantonment Executive Officer,  
Cantonment Board,  
Bareilly Cantonment.

Representing Workmen: Shri Mohd. Farid, President,  
Cantonment Labour Union,  
Bareilly Cantonment.

It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following dispute to the arbitration of Shri Shyam Krishna, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Kanpur.

#### (1) Specific matters in dispute:

Whether the action of the management of Cantonment Board, Bareilly Cantonment in retiring the following eleven sweepers/ sweepresses with effect from the 20th May, 1972



was justified? If not, to what relief the affected workmen are entitled?

Names:

1. Shri Itwari S/o Shri Gidai.
2. Shri Chiroojee S/o Shri Babu.
3. Shri Govind S/o Shri Phool Chand.
4. Shri Baboo S/o Shri Sukhi.
5. Shri Rama S/o Shri Chiddu.
6. Shri Pusey S/o Shri Gidai.
7. Shrimati Dulari W/o Shri Chotey.
8. Shri Shyam Lal S/o Shri Kalloo.
9. Shri Jhanku S/o Shri Khamani.
10. Shrimati Rama W/o Shri Sukhi.
11. Shrimati Changia W/o Shri Kewal.

(ii) Details of the parties to the dispute including the names and address of the establishment or undertaking involved:—

Management of the Cantonment Board, Bareilly Cantonment.

(iii) Name of the workmen in case he himself is involved in the dispute or the name of the Union, if any representing the workman or workmen in question:

President, Cantonment Labour Union, Bareilly Cantonment.

(iv) Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected:

About 330.

(v) Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute:

Eleven employees as mentioned above.

We further agree that the decision of the arbitrator shall be binding on us.

The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of 3 months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing.

**Representing employer:** Shri B. L. Dhawan,  
Cantonment Executive Officer,  
Cantonment Board,  
Bareilly Cantonment.

**Representing workmen:** Shri Mohd. Farid, President,  
Cantonment Labour Union,  
Bareilly.

**Witnesses:—**

1. Sd/- S. Prakash,  
Labour Enforcement Officer (C),  
Bareilly.
2. Sd/- Ashok Srivastava, L.D.C.,  
Office of the Labour Enforcement  
Officer (Central),  
Bareilly.

I agree to act as an Arbitrator in the dispute between Cantonment Board, Bareilly and their workmen over the retrenchment of 11 sweepers and sweepresses.

Sd/—

SHYAM KRISHNA,

Dated 15 March 1974

Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) Kanpur,  
[F. No. L-13011/1/73-LR.J]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 17th April, 1974

**S.O. 1088.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act, from Shri Kedar and Shri Rambrich, M.C. Loaders in Jealgora Colliery, which was received by the Central Government on the 3rd April, 1974

8 G of 1/74—9

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1 AT DHANBAD**

In the matter of a complaint under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

**Complaint No. 1 of 1973**

(Arising out of Reference No. 93 of 1971)

**Parties:**

1. Shri Kedar, M. C. Loader and
  2. Shri Rambrich, M. C. Loader, Jealgora Colliery C/o. The Secretary, Bihar Coal Miners' Union, No. 10, Digwadih, Dist. Dhanbad
- .....Complainant.

**VERSUS**

The Chairman & Managing Director, Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Bhagatdih Building, Distt. Dhanbad,  
.....Opposite Party.

**Present:**

Mr. Justice D. D. Seth (Retd.), Presiding Officer.

**Appearances:**

For the Complainants—Shri T. P. Choudhury, Advocate.

For the Opposite party—Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

**State:** Bihar.

**Industry:** Coal.

**AWARD**

This is a Complaint under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, made by two workmen, namely Shri Kedar and Rambrich, both M. C. Loaders in Jealgora Colliery in reference No. 93 of 1971 against the Chairman and Managing Director of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, opposite party, complaining against the action of the opposite party in dismissing them from their services with effect from 18th October, 1972 by orders Nos. A/653/72 and A/654/72 respectively issued by the Agent of the Jealgora Group of Collieries, of the opposite party on the alleged ground of misconduct. The complaint was filed before this Tribunal on 3-9-1973.

The case of the complainants as contained in their complaint under section 33A, is that they had been working in the Jealgora Colliery of the opposite party for about 13 and 14 years and had very good records of service. It is also alleged by the two complainants that on the relevant date of their dismissal from service reference No. 93 of 1971 in which all the workmen of Jealgora Colliery including two complainants were directly connected and were parties was pending before this Tribunal. It is also alleged that the opposite party was also a party to the said reference No. 93 of 1971. The case of the two complainants, further, is that they were dismissed by the opposite party in contravention of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act and the provisions of that section were infringed by the opposite party. The two complainants have stated in their complaint that they are active members of the Bihar Coal Miners' Union which was the majority union in the management and that the Manager of the concerned collieries issued charge-sheets Nos. JO/141/72 and JO/142/72, both dated 19-9-1972 to the two complainants, namely, Shri Kedar and Shri Rambrich respectively. The charges framed under Rule 27(5) (9) (18) (19) of the Standing Orders of the concerned collieries contained the following allegation:—

"It is reported that during your duty hours on 18-9-1972 in the 2nd Shift you left your longwall section at about 7.30 p.m. without any permission from your superiors and instigated the M. C. Loaders of 16th and 17th level of 13B now section II Pit Jealgora Colliery to adopt go-slow tactics and to cause loss to the out-put".

The complainants were suspended forthwith by an order passed by the Manager of the Colliery. They replied to the charge-sheets served on them individually denying all the charges and further stating that the management had made false charges in order to cover up their fault of non supply of tubs for several days from before the alleged day of occurrence. The complaints also stated in their replies that the charge-sheets had been issued to them in order to harass and victimise them.

The two complainants also stated in their application that the opposite party conducted an enquiry which was held on different dates beginning from 26th September, 1972 and, according to the complainants, that enquiry was improper as it suffered from very serious irregularities and infirmities and, further, that the complainants were denied an opportunity to defend themselves during the course of the enquiry and, thus, natural justice had been denied to them. According to the complainants the findings of the enquiry officer were perverse and the charges levelled against the two concerned workmen were not proved. Thus, the order of dismissal passed by the Agent, Jealgora Group of collieries was illegal, wrongful and unjustified. The complainants deny that they had instigated other M. C. Loaders who adopted go-slow tactics and no loss of output was caused on account of the alleged go-slow tactics. The dismissal of the complainants by the opposite party amounted to victimisation and was made on account of the complainants' lawful trade union activities. The action of the opposite party in dismissing the complainants was *malafide* and the opposite party is guilty of having adopted unfair labour practice. The complainants also state that after receiving the dismissal order they appealed to a higher authority to re-consider the action of the opposite party by filing appeal dated 30-10-1972 addressed to the Sub-Area Manager, Sub-Area No. XVI, Jealgora, praying that the orders of dismissal be set aside but the appeals were summarily rejected.

The complainants pray that the orders of their dismissal from service be set aside and the opposite party be directed to re-instate them at their original service with full back wages.

On receipt of the complainant usual notice was issued by this Tribunal to the opposite party and a written statement on behalf of the opposite party was filed on 26-11-1973.

The case of the opposite party, as contained in the written statement filed on behalf of the Chairman and Managing Director of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, is that the complaint under section 33A is illegal and is not maintainable as it does not disclose the employers against whom the complaint has been filed. According to them the Chairman and Managing Director of Bharat Coking Coal Limited have unnecessarily been made parties to the proceedings. It is also denied by the opposite party that the provisions of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 were violated. According to the opposite party, the two concerned workmen were dismissed with effect from 18-10-72 for proved misconducts. It is admitted by the opposite party that the two complainants were concerned in reference No. 93 of 1971. According to the opposite party the misconducts for which the two complainants were dismissed were not connected with the dispute which was the subject matter of reference No. 93 of 1971. The opposite party further contends that the two concerned workmen were charge-sheeted for leaving their places of work without permission from their superiors and also for instigating other M. C. Loaders to adopt go-slow tactics and, thus, causing loss of production. According to the opposite party since the misconducts committed by the two complainants were of serious nature they were suspended pending departmental enquiry and that a thorough departmental enquiry was held in the presence of the two concerned workmen and they were given full opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses produced by the management and to defend themselves. It is further the case of the opposite party that, as a result of the departmental enquiry the misconducts mentioned in the charge-sheets served on the two complainants were satisfactorily established. The opposite party denies that the findings of the enquiry officer were perverse and further states that the departmental enquiry was fair and proper and was conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice. The opposite party denies that the orders of dismissal passed against the two concerned complainants are illegal, wrongful or unjustified and further denies that the dismissal of the two complainants amounted to an act of victimisation "for their lawful trade union activities". The opposite party admits that the two complainants filed their appeals before higher authority for re-consideration of the orders of the dismissal passed against them but the higher authority found that no case for re-considering the orders of dismissal had been made out and hence the appeals were rejected. According to the opposite party the dismissal orders passed against the two complainants were *bonafide* and were based on proved misconducts. The opposite party, therefore, prays that the complainant under section 33A be dismissed.

On 7-12-1973 Shri S. S. Mukherjee, learned counsel appearing for the opposite party, filed 7 items of documents of which he gave a list to Shri P. Chanda who appeared for the two concerned workmen on that date. Shri P. Chanda was allowed time to go through the documents filed on behalf of the management and then file documents on behalf of the two concerned workmen. Out of 7 items of documents filed by Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Shri P. Chanda admitted documents at items No. 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7 of the list of documents filed by Shri S. S. Mukherjee and, on his admission, those documents were marked Ext. M-1, M-2, M-3, M-4 and M-5 respectively. Shri P. Chanda did not admit documents at items No. 4 and 5 of the list submitted by Shri S. S. Mukherjee.

The complainant was listed on 18-2-1974 when Shri T.P. Choudhury appeared on behalf of the two complainants. On that date Shri T. P. Choudhury filed an application for calling the following 5 items of documents from the management and served a copy of the application on Shri S. S. Mukherjee:—

- "1. Original joint application dated 29-9-72 submitted by Kedar and Rambrich addressed to the Manager, Jealgora Colliery.
2. Original joint application dated 29-9-1972 submitted by Kedar and Rambrich addressed to the Manager, Jealgora Colliery.
3. Original joint application dated 3-10-1972 submitted by Kedar and Rambrich addressed to the Manager, Jealgora Colliery.
4. Original joint application dated 30-10-72 submitted by Kedar and Rambrich addressed to the Sub-Area Manager, Sub-Area No. XVI, Jealgora.
5. Certified copy of the Standing Orders".

Shri S. S. Mukherjee, thereupon, prayed for time for the production of documents called for.

On 12-3-1974 Shri S. S. Mukherjee, appeared for the opposite party and filed original joint application dated 30-10-1972 submitted by the two complainants addressed to the Sub-Area Manager, Sub-Area No. XVI, Jealgora and a certified copy of the Standing Orders. For the other 3 items of documents called for on behalf of the complainants by Shri T. P. Choudhury Shri S. S. Mukherjee stated that those 3 items of documents were not traceable and hence could not be filed.

The same day Shri S. S. Mukherjee filed 2 more items of documents and served copies of those 2 documents on Shri T. P. Choudhury who admitted both the documents. On admission of the two documents by Shri T. P. Choudhury those documents were marked Ext. M-6, M-7. Shri T.P. Choudhury also admitted the copies of the Standing Orders filed by Shri S. S. Mukherjee and, on his admission, the copy of the Standing Orders was marked Ext. M-8.

Various Exts. filed by the opposite party and admitted by Shri T. P. Choudhury may now be discussed. Ext. M-1 is the charge-sheet No. 10/141/72 dated 19-9-1972 issued to Shri Kedar by the management. Ext. M-2 is the charge-sheet No. 10/142/72 dated 19-9-1972 issued to Shri Rambrich. Ext. M-3 is the reply of Shri Kedar and Shri Rambrich to the charge-sheets served on them. Ext. M-3 consists of two papers marked Ext. M-3A and M-3B. Ext. M-4 is the letter of dismissal dated 18-10-1972 issued to Shri Kedar and Shri Rambrich. Ext. M-4 also consists of two papers, namely order of dismissal served on Shri Kedar and order of dismissal served on Shri Rambrich. Ext. M-5 is letter No. I-2012/23/73-ER. II dated 19th November, 1973 addressed to the Manager of Jealgora Colliery and to the Secretary to the Bihar Coal Miners' Union by the Deputy Secretary, in the Ministry of Labour, Government of India. Ext. M-6 is the office copy of letter No. 107660 dated 3-11-1972 addressed to Shri Rambrich by the Sub-Area Manager. Ext. M-7 is the office copy of letter No. 107661 dated 3-11-1972 addressed to Shri Kedar by the Sub-Area Manager. Ext. M-8 is the copy of the Standing Orders of the concerned Colliery.

The documentary evidence filed on behalf of the concerned workmen will be mentioned while the oral evidence produced on behalf of the workmen is discussed.

I now proceed to discuss the oral evidence produced by the parties.

The only witness produced by the management is Shri B. K. Singh who was Personnel Officer of the Colliery at the relevant time and till December, 1972. He held the Departmental enquiry against the two concerned workmen. According to him the two workmen were present at the time of the enquiry and the witness stated that he took down the statements of the witnesses produced by the management in the presence of the workmen and read over and explained the same to the two concerned workmen in Hindi. The witness further stated that he gave full opportunity to the workmen to cross-examine the witnesses and the two workmen also gave their written statement which were recorded by the witness who read over and explained the same to them in Hindi. The workmen did not produce any defence witness. The witness was shown the statements of the witnesses recorded by him and stated that they were in his own handwriting. According to the witness the statements of the witnesses bore the signatures of the witnesses and also the left thumb impression and signatures of the workmen except in the case of one witness, namely, Shri Nizammudin. The witness proved the statements of the witnesses which were marked Ext. M-9. After completing the enquiry Shri B. K. Singh submitted his report which was dated 16th October, 1972 and bore his signature. The witness proved the report submitted by him which was marked Ext. M-10. Shri B. K. Singh stated that he was not biased against the two workmen and further stated that during the enquiry proceedings the two witnesses made no complaint against the witness for holding the enquiry.

Cross-examined by Shri T. P. Choudhury on behalf of the workmen, the witness stated that he had held other enquiries also. Shri B. K. Singh also stated that he had held a joint enquiry in respect of the two concerned workmen and that he did not give numbers to the witnesses examined by him. Both the workmen had submitted explanations denying the charges levelled against them. Shri B. K. Singh further stated that during the enquiry the two workmen admitted that they had committed the alleged misconduct which did not strike the witness as anything unusual. Shri T. P. Choudhury drew the attention of Shri B. K. Singh to the various pages of Ext. M-9 and asked him if there were interpolations made in the statements of the witnesses recorded by him during the course of the enquiry. The witness denied the suggestion that he had made any interpolations in the statements of the witnesses. Shri B. K. Singh further stated that he had recorded the statement of the witness, Shri B. Prasad in regard to Shri Rambrich only and that he had numbered Shri B. Prasad as PW-1. Shri B. K. Singh also stated that he had recorded the statement of Shri Gyan Chand in respect of the charge-sheets against both the workmen and that he had marked Shri Gyan Chand as PW-2 and further that he had recorded the statement of Shri Sheo Rash Singh in respect of Shri Rambrich alone and that he had described that witness as PW-3. The witness denied that there were interpolations in the 11th and 12th line of page 9 of Ext. M-9 or that the expression "and when" had been written later on. The witness also denied the suggestion that in the last line at page 9 of Ext. M-9 he had written the sentence "I have no witness to produce" subsequently even when there was no place left for incorporating that sentence. At page 11 of Ext. M-9 Shri B. K. Singh recorded the statement of Shri P. N. Mohay in respect of the charge-sheets served on both the workmen but did not give any number to Shri Mohay. Shri B. K. Singh, recorded that statement of Shri M. Chatterjee at page 14 of Ext. M-9 in regard to both the workmen and had marked Shri Chatterjee as PW-4. According to the witness at page 16 of Ext. M-9 cross-examination of the witness by Shri Kedar is recorded. The witness was asked as to which workman the last expression at page 16 i.e. "I have no further question to ask from Shri Mantosh Chatterjee, Overman" related and stated that that statement referred to Shri Kedar only. Later on the witness stated that that statement referred to Shri Rambrich. Although it was not noted by Shri B. K. Singh that he had asked Shri Rambrich to cross-examine Shri Mantosh but Shri Singh still maintained that he had asked Shri Rambrich to cross-examine Shri Chatterjee but he had declined to do so. Shri B. K. Singh also denied the suggestion that at page 14 of Ext. M-9 the sentence "Shri Rambrich M. C. Loader II Pit Jealgora Colliery Charge-sheet No. JO/142 dated 19-9-1972" had been subsequently added by him. At page 19 of Ext. M-9 Shri

B. K. Singh recorded the statement of Wasi Ahmed in respect of both the workmen and described him as PW-5. Shri B. K. Singh denied the suggestion that at page 17 of Ext. M-9 in the 3rd line from the top he had added the expression "in respect of charge-sheet issued to Shri Kedar, M. C. Loader and Shri Rambrich, M. C. Loader II Pit Jealgora Colliery" subsequently. Shri B. K. Singh explained that at page 18 of Ext. M-9 he had noted that the cross-examination of Shri Wasi Ahmed, Mining Sirdar was by Shri Kedar. The witness maintained that he had asked Rambrich to cross-examine Shri Wasi Ahmed but Rambrich declined. At page 19 of Ext. M-9 Shri B. K. Singh recorded the statement of Shri Nizammudin in respect of the charge-sheets served on both the concerned workmen and stated that he gave no number to Shri Nizammudin. Shri B. K. Singh also stated that at page 20 of Ext. M-9 he had recorded the statement of Shri Nizammudin in the presence of both the concerned workmen who refused to put their signatures on the statement. The witness admitted that the entire writing at page 20 of Ext. M-9 was in a different ink and explained that it was so as the original ink had finished. Shri Jagdish Singh referred to at that page was a peon of the management on the relevant dates and he was attached to the office of the witness. The witness denied the suggestion that his explanation that the original ink had finished was incorrect. At page 21 Shri B. K. Singh recorded the statement of Shri A. K. Roy, in respect of Shri Kedar only and explained that he had himself crossed out the portion which reads as follows: "and Rambrich M. C. Loader". The witness denied the suggestion that in the statement of Shri A. K. Roy the expression "Tubs" was not in the handwriting of the witness. The witness admitted that it is his normal practice to put his initials when he crosses out any writing. The witness admitted that it is apparent that his initials are not in the two writings mentioned just above and stated that he had marked Shri A. K. Roy as PW-1 in respect of Shri Kedar only. The witness denied that the number given to Shri A. K. Roy as PW-1 had been given by someone else. At page 2 of Ext. M-9 Shri B. K. Singh recorded the statement of Shri Lakhan and stated that he had written that Shri Lakhan's statement was in respect of both the workmen and that he had described Shri Lakhan as PW-2.

On a question put by the Tribunal the witness stated that the statement of PW-2 was in respect of Shri Kedar only but went on to state a perusal of the statement of PW-2 shows that his statement was in respect of both the workmen.

The witness admitted that except in the case of Shri Mantosh Chatterjee he had not put down the dates on which the other witnesses were examined by him. The witness denied that there was an interpolation at page 28 of Ext. M-9 or that he used some expression on that page in different ink. According to Shri B. K. Singh from page 20 onwards of Ext. M-9 Shri Rambrich did not put his left thumb impression and, according to the witness, those pages were not in respect of Shri Rambrich. The witness denied the suggestion that originally no thumb impression of Shri Rambrich had been taken and that he had asked Shri Rambrich to put his thumb impression on a bunch of sheets and while putting his thumb impression Shri Rambrich discovered one blank sheet and therefore he refused to put his thumb impression. According to Shri B. K. Singh the two concerned workmen never objected to the taking down of all the statements of witnesses by him in English during the enquiry proceedings. The witness was shown a document dated 29-9-1972 which bears the thumb impression of Shri Rambrich and the signature of Shri Kedar and was asked by Shri T. P. Choudhury whether the document bears the signature of his office clerk, namely Shri Durga Sarkar and Shri B. K. Singh replied that he was not in a position to identify the signature of Shri Durga Sarkar.

Shri B. K. Singh admitted that he had not noted anywhere that the workman had not objected to the recording of the statements of the management's witnesses in English and further admitted that he had not asked either of the two workmen that he might take the help of his co-workers as none of the two workmen had requested for it. The witness denied the suggestion that the two concerned workmen had asked for the help of their co-workers who understood English but the management had not allowed their request. Shri B. K. Singh stated that he wrote the enquiry report Ext. M-10 himself and stated that that report was originally written in his handwriting. The witness was unable to state if the

original manuscript of his report is available now. The witness denied the suggestion that Ext. M-10 was not written by him but was written by somebody else. The witness also denied the suggestion that he did not give any opportunity to the concerned workmen to conduct their defence and also denied the suggestion that any forgery was committed by him during the course of the departmental enquiry. The witness also denied the suggestion that the departmental enquiry was a farce.

The first witness produced on behalf of the workmen is Shri Hem Chakravarty who is the Vice President of Bihar Coal Miners' Union. He stated that he knows both the concerned workmen who are members and active workers of the Union. Shri Chakravarty knows that disciplinary proceedings against Shri Kedar and Shri Rambrich were taken by the opposite party. The witness stated that while departmental proceedings were being conducted against the two workmen they protested in the office of the Bihar Coal Miners' Union that the proceedings were being recorded by the enquiry officer in English inspite of the fact that the workmen had requested the officer to record the proceedings in Hindi. The witness was shown 3 applications which were submitted to the Manager of the Colliery by the two workmen through the Union. Two of those three applications were made on 29-9-1972 and the 3rd was made on 3-10-1972. The two applications made on 29-9-1972 were in the handwriting of Shri R. P. Singh. The witness stated that he knew Shri R. P. Singh's handwriting and further stated that Shri R. P. Singh is one of the important worker of the Union. According to the witness copies of the two applications dated 29-9-1972 submitted to the management were sent to the Union and were received in the office of the management by Shri B. K. Sarkar, the office clerk or somebody else. The witness had seen the signatures of Shri B. K. Singh on other applications also which were sent to the management. Shri Hem Chakravarty stated that the two workmen had put their thumb impression or signatures on the two applications. Those two applications were marked Ext.W-1 and Ext.W-2. The 3rd application dated 3-10-1972 was typed in the office of the Union and on that application Shri Rambrich put his thumb impression and Shri Kedar had put his signature. That application was addressed to the Manager of the Colliery and was received by the office clerk, Shri B. K. Sarkar. A copy of that application was sent to the Sub-Area General Manager, Jealgora and the Chief Personnel and Industrial Relations Officer of Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Jharia. The 3rd application dated 3-10-1972 was marked Ext.W-3.

Cross-examined by Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Shri Chakravarty stated that he is not an employee of the concerned colliery and that the office of Bihar Coal Miners' Union is within a mile of the colliery. A membership register is maintained in the Union Office. The witness admitted that the Union's Office did not forward a copy of the list of members of the Union to the management of the Colliery. According to the witness the full name of Shri R. P. Singh is Ram Pyara Singh who is a dismissed worker of the Tata Collieries and is still in the office of the Bihar Coal Miners' Union although he is not a member of the Union. The witness stated that he had not accompanied the two workmen when they went to the office of the opposite party to deliver Exts. W-1 and W-2. The witness was unable to state if Exts. W-1 and W-2 had reached the manager of the Colliery. Similar answer was given by the witness in regard to the Ext. W-3. The witness knew that the two workmen were present during the departmental enquiry even after they had delivered Exts. W-1 and W-2 in the office of the management. The witness admitted that he has no personal knowledge if the Exts. W-1, W-2 and W-3 were forwarded to the enquiry officer. The witness denied the suggestion that the Exts. W-1 and W-2 were subsequently got up documents.

After the Cross-examination by Shri S. S. Mukherjee the witness was discharged.

At this stage it seems necessary to discuss briefly Exts. W-1, W-2 and W-3. Ext. W-1 is a copy of the letter addressed to the manager of the Colliery and is dated 19-9-1972. It bears the left thumb impression of Shri Rambrich and the signature in Hindi of Shri Kedar. By these Exts. a complaint was made by the two workmen about the recording of the proceedings of the departmental enquiry by the enquiry officer in English and it was also stated that the two workmen had no knowledge of English. A request was, therefore, made that the enquiry officer be advised to allow one man to be present during the enquiry who was a co-worker of

the two workmen and who knew English and could explain the enquiry proceedings to the two workmen in Hindi. On the bottom left side of Ext. W-1 there is somebody's signature dated 29-9-72. The signature is illegible.

Ext. W-2 is also a copy of the letter addressed by the two workmen to the manager of the Colliery and is also dated 19-9-1972. It also bears the left thumb impression of Shri Rambrich and the signature of Shri Kedar in Hindi. By this Ext. a request was made that the two workmen be supplied copies of the enquiry proceedings. At the bottom left side of this Ext. there is somebody's signature and below that signature there is a date viz "29-9-72". The signature is illegible.

Ext. W-3 is the copy of another letter sent by the two workmen to the Manager of the Colliery. Ext. W-3 is dated 3-10-1972 and bears the signature of Shri Kedar in Hindi and the thumb impression of Shri Rambrich. By this Ext. the Manager of the colliery was told that two workmen had been stopped from doing their work in the colliery since 20-9-1972 but the enquiry regarding the charge-sheets submitted on the two workmen had not yet concluded although the date of the enquiry was fixed on 26-9-1972. The Manager was further told by Ext. W-3 that the charges against the two workmen had not been proved during the enquiry and hence the workmen requested the manager that he should allow them to resume their duties without any further delay.

The second witness produced on behalf of the workmen is Shri Kedar Nath WW-2. He is one of the concerned workmen.

In the Examination-in-Chief by Shri T. P. Choudhury, Shri Kedar Nath stated that he knows Rambrich and that he and Rambrich were Machine Loaders at II Pit Jealgora Colliery and had been working in that colliery for about 14 years. Shri Kedar Nath stated that he and Rambrich had received charge-sheets from the management to which they had submitted their explanations and, thereupon, a domestic enquiry was held by Shri B. K. Singh. That enquiry was conducted for more than one day and the proceedings during the enquiry were recorded in English. The witness further stated that neither he nor Rambrich knows English and that the enquiry proceedings were not read over and explained to the two workmen in Hindi by the enquiry officer. When the workmen protested against the recording of the proceedings in English they were told by the enquiry officer that since they had not done anything wrong nothing will happen to them and that they will be paid their wages. According to Shri Kedar Nath both the workmen asked the enquiry officer to take down the enquiry proceedings in Hindi but the enquiry officer continued to write the proceedings in English. Thereupon, the two workmen suggested to the enquiry officer that if he was going to write the proceedings in English he should allow the workmen to be assisted by a person who knows English but this request was not allowed. Shri Kedar Nath further stated that when the enquiry proceedings started he and Rambrich were told that the explanations submitted by them were not with the management and hence they should furnish fresh explanations. The two workmen, therefore, gave fresh explanations. Sometimes the witness was called by the enquiry officer and sometimes Shri Rambrich was called. Both the two workmen were never called together and none of the two workmen was allowed any opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses produced by the management. Shri Kedar Nath also stated that he had been taking his witnesses daily at the enquiry but he was not allowed to produce them. The witness denied that either he or Rambrich had admitted their guilt before the enquiry officer, and further stated that both he and Rambrich are members of the Bihar Coal Miners' Union and take interest in the work of the Union and also make subscriptions to the Union.

Cross-examined by Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Shri Kedar Nath stated that he had been charge-sheeted six times before the present charge-sheet, out of which this complaint has arisen and that he had been punished earlier also. He was warned and was suspended. The witness denied that the earlier six charge-sheets were served on him on account of leaving his place of work assigned to him. In respect of the present charge-sheet the witness stated that he and Rambrich had left their explanations in a box in the office of the management kept for that purpose. Shri Kedar Nath also stated that he and Rambrich had received a letter from the management alleging that the explanations sub-

mitted by them had not been received by the management and the two workmen were asked to submit fresh explanations. The enquiry was held for 4 or 5 days and on the very first day the two workmen told the enquiry officer to take down the depositions of the witnesses of the management in Hindi and also gave a letter in writing to that effect to the enquiry officer, asking the enquiry officer to allow them to engage an English knowing Co-worker during the departmental enquiry. According to the witness the two workmen had kept copies of that letter and that letter also contains the initials of the enquiry officer. Shri Kedar Nath, however, admitted that neither he nor Rambrich had given any letter in writing to the enquiry officer complaining that they were not being allowed to cross-examine the management's witnesses. Shri Kedar Nath also admitted that he and Rambrich had not submitted any letter in writing to the enquiry officer mentioning either the names of the defence witnesses or that the two workmen had been taking defence witnesses to be examined during the enquiry. The witness denied that the depositions taken down by the enquiry officer were read over to the two workmen and explained to them in Hindi.

On a question put by the Tribunal the witness replied that after the enquiry had been conducted for 4 or 5 days he signed all the depositions of the management's witnesses which were given to the two workmen by the enquiry officer and further stated that he had to sign those depositions as the enquiry officer had threatened him and actually one day had compelled the witness to be thrown out through the help of a peon about which the witness complained to his Union.

Now I proceed to deal with the contentions raised by the learned counsel for the parties.

The first contention of Shri T. P. Choudhury, appearing for the workmen, is that in the instant case there was a clear violation of the provisions of section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act for which there is no explanation in the written statement filed by the opposite party. According to Shri T. P. Choudhury the violation of the provisions of section 33(2)(b) of the Act, in itself, amounted to gross unfair labour practice and victimisation.

It is an admitted fact that the two concerned workmen in this complaint were also parties in the Reference No. 93 of 1971 which was pending when the complaint was filed and Shri S. S. Mukherjee, appearing for the opposite party, very fairly conceded that no application for approval of the order of dismissal of the two workmen was sought for from this Tribunal as required by section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act. According to Shri S. S. Mukherjee violation of the provisions of section 33(2)(b) by the management only entitled the workmen to file a complaint under section 33A of the Act and any violation of the provisions of section 33(2)(b) did not automatically entitle the workmen to be re-instated at their original posts.

Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act deal with conditions of service and reads as follows :—

"3. Conditions of service, etc., to remain unchanged under certain circumstances during pendency of proceedings.—(1) During the pendency of any conciliation proceeding before a conciliation officer or a Board or of any proceeding before an arbitrator or a Labour Court or Tribunal or National Tribunal in respect of an industrial dispute, no employer shall—

- (a) in regard to any matter connected with the dispute, alter, to the prejudice of the workmen concerned in such dispute, the conditions of service applicable to them immediately before the commencement of such proceeding; or
- (b) for any misconduct connected with the dispute, discharge or punish, whether by dismissal or otherwise, any workmen concerned in such dispute, save with the express permission in writing of the authority before which the proceeding is pending.

(2) During the pendency of any such proceeding in respect of an industrial dispute, the employer may, in accordance with the standing orders applicable to a workman concerned in such dispute, or, where there are no such standing orders, in accordance with the terms of the contract, whether express or implied, between him and the workman,—

- (a) alter, in regard to any matter not connected with the dispute, the conditions of service applicable to that workman immediately before the commencement of such proceeding; or
- (b) for any misconduct not connected with the dispute discharge or punish, whether by dismissal or otherwise, that workman.

Provided that no such workmen shall be discharged or dismissed, unless he has been paid wages for one month and an application has been made by the employer to the authority before which the proceeding is pending for approval of the action taken by the employer.

- (3) .....
- (a) .....
- (b) .....

Explanation.—

- (4) .....
- (5) where an employer makes an application to a conciliation officer, Board, an arbitrator, a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal under the proviso to sub-section (2) for approval of the action taken by him, the authority concerned shall, without delay, hear such application and pass, as expeditiously as possible, such order in relation thereto as it deems fit."

Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act deal with special provisions for adjudication as to whether conditions of service changed during the pendency of the proceedings and runs as follows :—

33A. Special provision for adjudication as to whether conditions of service, etc., changed during pendency of proceedings.—Where an employer contravenes the provisions of section 33 during the pendency of proceedings before a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal, any employee aggrieved by such contravention, may make a complaint in writing, in the prescribed manner to such Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal and on receipt of such complaint that Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall adjudicate upon the complaint as if it were a dispute referred to or pending before it, in accordance with the provisions of this Act and shall submit its award to the appropriate Government and the provisions of this Act shall apply accordingly.

The scope of section 33 and 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act were considered by the Supreme Court in *Air-India Corporation, Bombay and V. A. Rebellow and another*, 1972 Vol. (1) Labour Law Journal page 501 and the relevant portions of the Supreme Court's observations at page 507 on the scope of the 2 sections read as follows :—

"The basic object of these two sections broadly speaking appears to be to protect the workmen concerned in the disputes which form the subject-matter of pending conciliation proceedings or proceedings by way of reference under S. 10 of the Act, against victimisation by the employer on account of raising or continuing such pending disputes and to ensure that those pending proceedings are brought to expeditious termination in a peaceful atmosphere, undisturbed by any subsequent cause tending to further exacerbate the already strained relations between the employer and the workmen. To achieve this objective a ban, subject to certain conditions, has been imposed by S. 33 on the ordinary right of the employer to alter the terms of his employees' services to their prejudice or to terminate their services under the general law governing contract of employment and S. 33A provides for relief against contravention of S. 33, by way of adjudication of the complaints by aggrieved workmen considering them to be disputes referred or pending in accordance with the provisions of the Act. This ban, however, is designed to restrict interference with the general rights and liabilities of the parties under the ordinary law within the limits truly necessary for accomplishing the above object. The employer is accordingly left free to deal with the employees when the action concerned is not punitive or mala fide or does not amount to victimisation or unfair labour practice. The anxiety of the Legislature to effectively achieve the object of duly protecting the workmen against victimisation or unfair labour practices consistently with the preservation of the employer's bona fide right to main discipline and efficiency in the industry for securing the maximum production in a

peaceful harmonious atmosphere is obvious from the overall scheme of these sections. Turning first to S. 33, sub-s. (1) of this section deals with the case of a workman concerned in a pending dispute who has been prejudicially affected by an action in regard to a matter connected with such pending dispute and sub-s. (2) similarly deals with workman concerned in regard to matters unconnected with such pending disputes. Sub-section (1) bans alteration to the prejudice of the workman concerned in the conditions of service applicable to him immediately before the commencement of the proceedings and discharge or punishment whether by dismissal or otherwise of the workman concerned for misconduct connected with the dispute without the express permission in writing of the authority dealing with the pending proceeding. Sub-section (2) places a similar ban in regard to matters not connected with the pending dispute but the employer is free to discharge or dismiss the workman by paying wages for one month provided he applies to the authority dealing with the pending proceeding for approval of the action taken. In the case before us we are concerned only with the ban imposed against orders of discharge or punishment as contemplated by cl. (b) of the two sub-sections. There are no allegations of alteration of the complainant's terms of service. It is not necessary for us to decide whether the present case is governed by sub-s. (1) or sub-s. (2) because the relevant clause in both the sub-sections is couched in similar language and we do not find any difference in the essential scope and purpose of these two sub-sections as far as the controversy before us is concerned. It is not worthy that the ban is imposed only in regard to action taken for misconduct whether connected or unconnected with the dispute."

Shri S. S. Mukherjee referred to a decision of the Supreme Court in *Hindustan General Electrical Corporation Limited and Bishwanath Prasad and another* Supreme Court Labour Judgments (8) 421 at page 425 in which also the scope of applicability of sections 33 and 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act were considered by the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court in that case observed as follows :—

"The scope of section 33 and 33A was examined by this Court in several cases to some of which we shall presently refer. Section 33(1) has obviously no application to the facts of this case. Section 33(2) relates to the dismissal, discharge etc. of a workman for any misconduct not connected with an industrial dispute during the pendency of any conciliation proceeding before a Conciliation Officer or a Board etc., unless he had been paid wages for one month and an application has been made by the employer to the authority before which the proceeding is pending for approval of the action taken by the employer. Section 33A enables a workman who has been punished by dismissal or discharge etc., to make a complaint in writing to a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal when an employer contravenes the provisions of Section 33 during the pendency of proceedings before Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal etc. If such a complaint is made, the Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal etc. is to adjudicate upon the complaint as if it were a dispute referred to or pending before it and in accordance with the provisions of the Act submit its award to the appropriate Government. In other words, when the conditions laid down in section 33A apply a workman who is punished as mentioned therein does not have to wait for a reference of an industrial dispute by an appropriate authority under section 10 of the Act for adjudication of the dispute but can himself prefer his complaint which is to be treated in the same way as a dispute under section 10. These sections do not lend themselves to the construction that as soon as the Labour Court, Tribunal etc. finds that there has been a violation of Section 33 it should award re-instatement. It must go through the proceedings which would have to be taken under section 10 and it would be the duty of Labour Court etc. to examine the merits of the case in the light of the principles formulated in the *Indian Iron and Steel Co.'s* case (1) :

The law laid down by the Supreme Court in case of dismissal of a workman on misconduct has been dealt with by that Hon'ble Court in *Indian Iron and Steel Company Limited and another* versus their workmen, 1958 Supreme Court Reports page 667 at page 685 and the relevant portion of the Supreme Court's observations in that case are thus :—

"Undoubtedly, the management of concern has power to direct its own internal administration and discipline; but the power is not unlimited and when a dispute arises Indus-

trial Tribunals have been given the power to see whether the termination of service of a workman is justified and to give appropriate relief. In cases of dismissal on misconduct, the Tribunal does not, however, act as a court of appeal and substitute its own judgment for that of the management. It will interfere (1) when there is a want of good faith, (2) when there is victimisation or unfair labour practice, (3) when the management has been guilty of a basic error or violation of a principle of natural justice, and (4) when on the materials the finding is completely baseless or perverse."

Shri S. S. Mukherjee referred to Ext. M-5 dated 19th November, 1973 which is a letter addressed to the Manager of the Colliery concerned and to the Secretary, Bihar Coal Miner's Union, Digwadih by the Deputy Secretary of the Ministry of Labour of the Government of India in which it was stated that in the opinion of the Central Government the dispute raised by the two workmen was not "fit for reference to an Industrial Tribunal for adjudication because the punishment was imposed on the basis of findings of proper domestic enquiry and the management has not acted mala fide or practised victimisation".

In my view Ext. M-5, that is, the view of the ministry of Labour, contained in that letter was only an opinion expressed by the Deputy Secretary of the Central Government and that opinion is not binding on this Tribunal.

In view of the fact that the provisions of section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act are of a mandatory nature and in view of the concession made by Shri S. S. Mukherjee that no application for approval of the action taken by the management against the two workmen was sought for from this Tribunal, it must be held that the management clearly violated the provisions of section 33(2)(b) of the Act but I agree with Shri S. S. Mukherjee that the violation of the provisions of section 33(2)(b) did not in itself entitle the two workmen to be re-instated at their services. It only entitled the workmen to file a complaint before this Tribunal under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act. I also agree with Shri T. P. Choudhury that if an application for approval of the action of the dismissal taken by the management against the two workmen had been filed by the management under section 33(2)(h) the two concerned workmen in his complaint would have got an opportunity to show that their dismissal was un-warranted. In view of the mandatory provisions of section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, it was the duty of the management to have filed an application under that section for approval of their action in dismissing the two workmen and in not doing so they clearly violated the provisions of that section.

The next contention of Shri T. P. Choudhury is that the Departmental enquiry held against the two workmen by Shri B. K. Singh was a shame enquiry and was not in accordance with the principles of natural justice and hence the orders of dismissal passed against the two workmen are vitiated and the workmen, are therefore entitled to be re-instated in their services. Shri T. P. Choudhury further submitted that during the enquiry proceedings no opportunity was given to the two workmen to defend themselves and the enquiry officer was guilty of making many interpolations in the various statements produced on behalf of the management. Shri T. P. Choudhury further submitted that the enquiry proceedings should have been recorded in Hindi as the two workmen do not know English and an opportunity should have been given to the workmen to be assisted by an English knowing co-worker. According to Shri T. P. Choudhury the management was determined to dismiss the two workmen because they were persona-non-grata with the management and therefore, the enquiry officer made several interpolations in the statements of the witnesses produced by the management and violated the principles of natural justice.

As regards the taking down of the proceedings during the enquiry in English, the law has been laid down by the Madras High Court in *Management of "Woodbariar" and workers in "Woodbariar"*, 1961 Vol. 2 Indian Factories and Labour Reports page 358, in which it was held as follows: "Where the dismissal of an employee is mala fide, or there was unfair labour practice, or victimisation, or the findings were perverse or baseless or the management had been guilty of any basic error or violation of any principles of natural justice, the Labour Tribunal has jurisdiction to interfere. But where the dismissal is as a result of bona fide enquiry the charges made not being actuated by any ulterior motive, it has no jurisdiction to interfere".



In a domestic enquiry, the guiding principle is that the enquiry should be conducted with due adherence to the principles of natural justice, that is without any bias, giving the employee an opportunity for adequately representing his case etc. There is, however, no obligation to take down evidence or take down evidence in any particular language. The obligation is only to make a proper enquiry. Therefore the complaints regarding language, omission to record evidence in any particular language, corrections in evidence recorded, absence of definite findings are not such defects which would justify interference".

In view of the above decision of the Madras High Court the fact that the enquiry officer took down the proceedings in English during the enquiry does not vitiate the enquiry and the submission of Shri T. P. Choudhury to that effect is not correct.

It may be mentioned in this connection that the two concerned workmen themselves filed their replies to the charge-sheets served on them in the English Language. Further, Shri Kedar Nath who was examined and cross-examined never filed any objection before the enquiry officer that the depositions of the witnesses produced by the management were being taken down in English and further that he continued to participate in the enquiry. Thus, we find that no request in writing was made by the two workmen that the depositions of the witnesses should be taken down in Hindi by the enquiry officer. If the two workmen did not like the proceedings to be taken down in English there was no reason for them to continue to participate in the enquiry.

Regarding the two workmen not having been permitted to take the help of an English-knowing Co-worker, in the domestic enquiry, it was for the two workmen to have chosen their own procedure and to have told the enquiry officer that they desired to be helped by an English-knowing co-worker and it was not for the enquiry officer to help the workmen in this connection.

Violation of procedure in a departmental enquiry does not vitiate the principles of natural justice, as was held by a learned Single Judge of the Calcutta High Court in *Howrah Trading Co. (P) Ltd.*, and *Fourth Industrial Tribunal, West Bengal* and another 1966 (12) *Indian Factories and Labour Reports* page 80.

Shri S. S. Mukherjee pointed out to me that the charges framed against the two workmen are contained in paragraphs 27(5), 27(9), 27(18), and 27(19) of the Standing Orders of the Colliery, Ext. M-8. But this statement is not quite correct because Paragraph 27(5) of the Standing Orders deals with Drunkenness, fighting and riotous or disorderly or indecent behaviour. Paragraph 27(9) deals with causing damage to work in progress or to property of the Company. For the misconduct alleged against the two workmen the relevant paragraphs of the Standing Orders are 27(18) that deals with leaving work without permission and paragraph 27(19) which deals with any breach of the Indian Mines Act, or any other Act, or of any rules or bye-laws thereunder, or of Standing Orders.

In this connection the case of *Tata Oil Mills Co., Ltd.*, and its workman 1964(II) L.L.J. page 13 relied upon by Shri S. S. Mukherjee is not at all relevant to the facts of the present case as that case dealt with the misconduct of drunkenness, fighting, riotous or disorderly behaviour and indecent behaviour within or without the factory. In the instant case the misconduct alleged against Shri Kedar was that during his duty hours on 18-9-1972 in the second shift he left his longwall section at about 7.30 p.m. without any permission from his superiors and instigated the M.C. Loaders of 16th and 17th level of 13B New Section II Pit of the Colliery concerned to adopt go-slow tactics and to cause loss to the out-put and the misconduct alleged against Shri Rambrich was that during his duty hours on 18-9-1972 in the second shift he left his 13A Section at about 7.30 p.m. without any permission from his superiors and instigated M.C. Loaders of 16th and 17th level of 13B New Section II Pit of the Colliery concerned to adopt go-slow tactics and to cause loss to the out-put.

The alleged misconduct levelled against the two workmen would be covered by paragraph 38(2)(b) of the Coal Mines Regulations 1957 which reads as follows :—

"(b) Subject to any directions that may be given by an official, no person shall, except for some justifiable purpose, go into any part of the mine other than that part in which he works, .....

Now I have to see whether the alleged misconduct against the two workmen was established in the domestic enquiry conducted by the enquiry officer and whether the enquiry was mala fide and was in violation of the principles of natural justice. If the answer is in the affirmative then, of course, the departmental enquiry would be vitiated and this Tribunal would have jurisdiction to interfere but if the answer is in the negative then this Tribunal can have no jurisdiction to interfere. Hence I now proceed to examine if there was a fair and proper enquiry and that enquiry was in accordance with the principles of natural justice.

In this connection the contention of Shri T. P. Choudhury is that the departmental enquiry was not fair and proper and violated the principles of natural justice and Shri Choudhury went on to suggest that the enquiry officer was even guilty of committing forgery in the enquiry proceedings and was also guilty of making several interpolations in the statements of the witnesses produced by the management before him and further that the enquiry officer added sentences in the statement of Shri Kedar which he had never made.

Before dealing with the above contention of Shri T. P. Choudhury it must be borne in mind that Shri B. K. Singh, who conducted the enquiry stated in the cross-examination that he had held several enquiries earlier to the present enquiry against the two workmen which means that he ought to have known proper procedure to be adopted during the departmental enquiry.

I have heard Shri T. P. Choudhury and Shri S. S. Mukherjee and have carefully gone through the enquiry proceedings, Ext. M-9 and the report of the enquiry officer, Ext. M-10 and I find that there are gross irregularities and illegalities in the enquiry proceedings and I also find that the enquiry officer was guilty of making several interpolations in the various statements of the witnesses and further was guilty of adding some sentences in the enquiry proceedings behind the back of the two workmen.

I shall now refer to the gross irregularities and illegalities committed by the enquiry officer.

The enquiry officer did not maintain any order-sheet of the day to day proceedings of the enquiry. The heading of the enquiry report, Ext. M-10 shows that the enquiry was held by the enquiry officer jointly against Shri Kedar and Shri Rambrich but a careful perusal of the enquiry proceedings shows that sometimes the enquiry was held jointly and sometimes Shri B. K. Singh held separate enquiries against the two workmen.

Paragraph 5 of the enquiry report, Ext. M-10 shows that the enquiry officer conducted the enquiry on 26-9-1972, 5-10-1972, 12-10-1972 and 14-10-1972 but there is nothing on record to corroborate that the enquiry was actually held on those days. Except in the case of Shri M. Chatterjee whom the enquiry officer numbered as P.W. 4 and whose deposition was in regard to both the workmen there are no dates below the statements of the witnesses produced by the management. Only the statement of Shri Mantosh Chatterjee bears the date "26-9-1972" below the signature of Shri Mantosh Chatterjee.

In all 10 witnesses produced by the management were examined during the enquiry and the two concerned workmen also gave their statements. The statement of Shri A. K. Roy, whom the enquiry officer numbered as P.W. 1 was against Shri Kedar only. The enquiry officer marked Shri B. Prasad also as P.W. 1. This was another gross irregularity made by the enquiry officer. Besides, the statement of Shri B. Prasad was only against Shri Rambrich. This shows that the enquiry was not held jointly as stated by the enquiry officer in his report, Ext. M-10.

Shri Gyan Chand and Shri Lakhar were both numbered as P.W.S. 2 and their statements were against both the workmen.

Shri Ramdeo was numbered as P.W. 3 and his statement was only against Shri Kedar. Sheogrash Singh was also numbered as P.W. 3 and his statement was only against Shri Rambrich.

It has been already stated above that the statement of Shri Mantosh Chatterjee P.W. 4 was in regard to both the workmen as was the statement of Shri Washi Ahmed P.W. 5. Shri Nizamuddin, another witness produced by the management was given no number by the enquiry officer and his statement was against both the workmen. Shri P. N. Mohay was also a witness on behalf of the management who was not given any number by the enquiry officer and his statement was also against both the workmen. The statement of Shri A. K. Roy whom the enquiry officer numbered as P.W. 1 shows that he made his statement at a time when only Shri Kedar was present and Shri Rambrich was not present. It may be stated at this stage that the enquiry officer had already given the number "P.W. 1" to Shri B. Prasad. When Shri Mantosh Chatterjee, P.W. 4 was examined by the enquiry officer it is clear that Shri Rambrich was not given any opportunity to cross-examine him which is clear from the fact that the cross-examination of Shri Mantosh Chatterjee was done by Shri Kedar only.

From page 20 onwards of the enquiry proceedings Ext. M-9, there are no left thumb impressions of Shri Rambrich and the presumption, naturally, arises that Shri Rambrich was not present when the proceedings after page 20 onwards of Ext. M-9 were recorded.

From the deposition of Shri Gyan Chand, who has been described as P.W. 2, it is clear that he made statements in regard to both Shri Kedar and Shri Rambrich but at the bottom of the statement of Shri Gyan Chand there is only the left thumb impression of Shri Rambrich and there is a note of the enquiry officer which shows that the statement of Shri Gyan Chand was read over and explained in Hindi to Shri Rambrich only and not to Shri Kedar because Shri Kedar who knows Hindi has not put his signature below the statement of Shri Gyan Chand. This is clear from the following sentence, obviously written by the enquiry officer at the end of the statement of Shri Gyan Chand:—"Read over and explained in Hindi to Shri Gyan Chand, Mining Sardar in presence of Shri Rambrich, M.C. Loader".

From the enquiry report, Ext. M-10 we find that the testimony of each of the witnesses produced by the management was used against both the workmen. This is clear from the first paragraph on page 2 of the enquiry report, Ext. M-10 and pages 3 and 4 (first paragraph of Ext. M-10). This was a clear violation of the principles of natural justice by the enquiry officer.

Another gross irregularity committed by the enquiry officer which amounted to the violation of the principles of natural justice was that the enquiry officer recorded the statement of the two workmen namely Shri Kedar and Shri Rambrich in between the statements of the witnesses produced by the management which was very improper and irregular.

From the perusal of Ext. M-9 it is impossible to state whether the enquiry proceedings were jointly against the two workmen or were partly, jointly or partly separately.

Now we come to the various alleged interpolations in the enquiry proceedings, Ext. M-9. At page 4 of Ext. M-9 in the statement of Shri Gyan Chand, P.W. 2, the word "Co" seems to have been added afterwards. Similarly the word "Co" seems to have been added later on in the 15th line at page 20 of the enquiry proceedings. At page 9 of Ext. M-9 the sentence "I have no witness to produce" alleged to have been made by Shri Rambrich seems to have been added later on as that sentence has been squeezed between the last sentence of the statement of Shri Rambrich and his left thumb impression at the end of his statement. At page 20 of Ext. M-9 at the bottom a paragraph has been written in a different ink and is clear from the fact that the statement of Shri Nizamuddin in the rest of page 20 and the top portion of page 21 of Ext. M-9 is in original ink.

At page 20 Shri Nizamuddin produced by the management has put his signatures at 3 places but his signature does not appear when his statement ends at the top of page 21.

Similarly at page 28 of Ext. M-9 the sentence "I have no witness to produce" said to have been made by Shri Kedar is in different ink than the other portion of Shri Kedar's statement. This is obvious to the naked eye. Further it is clear that that sentence has been interpolated and has been made to squeeze between the statement of Shri Kedar and his signature in Hindi.

Shri B. K. Singh, the enquiry officer, in his statement stated that wherever he crossed out any portion of the statement of the witnesses he put his initials but there are no initials to be found wherever some words have been added to the original statements of the witnesses. The statement of the enquiry officer that the sentence "I have no further question to ask from Shri Mantosh Chatterjee, Overman" refers to both the workmen is not correct because the enquiry officer admitted that he did not know that he had asked Shri Rambrich also to cross-examine Shri Chatterjee and that he declined. Similar at page 18 of Ext. M-9 it has been noted by the enquiry officer that the "cross-examination of Shri Washi Ahmed, Mining Sardar, by Shri Kedar, M. C. Loader" but in his statement Shri B. K. Singh maintains that he had asked Shri Rambrich also to cross-examine Shri Washi Ahmed but he had declined.

These are only some glaring instances of the various interpolations made in the enquiry proceedings. There are, however many other places where there are interpolations in the statements of the witnesses produced by the management but the few instances given above are enough to show that the enquiry proceedings were in violation of the principles of natural justice and I agree with Shri T. P. Choudhury that the departmental enquiry was a mere farce. The enquiry proceedings were bilateral proceedings because they were signed both by the witnesses produced by the management and also by Shri Kedar and at the end of some of the statements Shri Rambrich had put his thumb impression also. Thus, when the proceedings were altered at material points by interlineation, addition, rasings the proceedings, thereby, became void—See the decision of a Division Bench of the Allahabad High Court in Hardwar Singh and another Versus Hari Parshad Rai, 1943 A.I.R. Allahabad 24.

The contention of Shri S. S. Mukherjee that the witnesses produced by the management during the enquiry were grouped in 3 sections namely (1) against Shri Rambrich who was in 13A section of the Colliery and had left that section and had gone to 13B section and therefore only those witnesses who were present at that time in 13A section could depose against Shri Rambrich is not correct. According to Shri S. S. Mukherjee the witnesses against Shri Rambrich were (1) Shri B. Prasad, Overman of 13A Section (2) Shri Gyan Chand, Mining Sardar of Section 13A section and Shri Sheo Rash Singh, Munshi of 13A Section. Similarly, according to Shri S. S. Mukherjee Shri Kedar was in longwall section and therefore only those witnesses who were present in the longwall section could depose against Shri Kedar and such witness were (1) Shri A. K. Roy, (2) Shri Lakhan Mining Sardar and (3) Shri Ramdeo, Munshi. This contention is also not correct because we find that the testimony of each witness produced by the management was used by the enquiry officer against both the workmen. Shri Gyan Chand's depositions was recorded against both the workmen and similarly Shri Lakhan was examined in regard to both the workmen and not only against Shri Kedar.

Since I have found that many interpolations had been made during the enquiry proceedings in the statements of the witnesses and also that some sentences had been added in the statements of the two workmen, in my view, no sanctity can be attached to such enquiry proceedings and those proceedings cannot be relied upon. In my opinion such proceedings are non est in law and the findings of the enquiry officer arising out of such proceedings are vitiated.

For the above reasons my Award is that the dismissal of the two concerned workmen from their services with effect from 18-10-1972 on account of the alleged misconduct was illegal and therefore I allow the complaint of the two workmen and set aside the order of their dismissal. The two workmen are entitled to be re-instated at their original posts with full back wages with effect from 18-10-1972 till the date of their re-instatement.

I let a copy of this Award be forwarded to the Central Government for information under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

D. D. SETHI, Presiding Officer.

[No. J-2025/4/74-LRII.]

P. R. NAYAR, Dy. Secy.